The Forum

DECEMBER, 1894.

THE "BALTIMORE PLAN" OF CURRENCY REFORM.

THERE is a consensus of opinion that our currency-system,—or better, want of system,—is wrong. All political parties, all commercial interests, all labor interests, the debtor and the creditor agree that our currency system is ill-conceived, unresponsive to the various interests of our great nation, and prejudicial to renewed and stable prosperity. Here, however, harmony of opinion ceases.

Let us analyze our currency and the proposed remedies, which are various. There were in circulation on November 1, nine different kinds of money, nearly equally divided into gold, silver, and paper, classified as follows:

Gold Coin	$500,181,380
Standard Silver Dollars	56,443,670
Subsidiary Silver	60,242,999
Gold Certificates	64,252,069
Silver Certificates	331,143,301
Treasury Notes, Act July 14, 1890	122,715,396
United States Notes	280,474,705
Currency Certificates	54,045,000
National-Bank Notes	202,594,902
Total	$1,672,093,422

The gold currency needs no comment, for it is the currency of the nations, passing by weight and fineness.

Oldest of our paper money is the greenback—fiat money, pure and simple—issued by the Government and made a "legal tender at face value for all debts public and private except duties on imports and interest on the public debt," and used to defray the expenses of the war. In June, 1864, the volume of greenbacks reached $447,-

Copyright, 1893, by the Forum Publishing Company.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

300,203. Everybody recognized them as a forced loan, justified only by the exigencies of the war; and on December 18, 1865, Congress, by resolution, approved the policy and plan then pursued by Secretary McCulloch for retiring them. The amount was reduced to $346,681,016, in 1878, when Congress forbade further contraction.

Next in point of age comes the national-bank note. President Lincoln, in his message to Congress in 1862, strongly seconded the recommendation of Secretary Chase to create a national banking system. Accordingly an act was passed in 1863 and revised in 1864. As a measure of currency reform it did not commend itself to Congress, as is shown by the debates and the votes. The national-banks were created, with authority to issue circulation based upon Government bonds, for the sole purpose of furnishing a market for such bonds, and thus enabling the Government to meet the financial exigencies incident to the war. This law was supplemented by a tax of 10 per cent imposed upon State-bank circulation in March, 1864. The national-banks rapidly increased, became large purchasers and permanent holders of Government bonds, and absorbed them from the market, thus appreciating their price and strengthening the credit of the Government. The plenitude and comparative cheapness of bonds and their high rate of interest rendered circulation profitable. This law accomplished the purpose for which it was created, but its framers did not contemplate providing a currency adapted to the wants of a great nation, nor did they suceeed in so doing. These notes are receivable for all dues to the United States "except duties on imports," and for all payments by the United States "except interest on the public debt, and in redemption of the national currency," and are legal payment to national-banks.

The first coinage act of this country, in 1792, provided for the coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of 15 to 1, which ratio undervalued silver. In 1834 the amount of fine gold in the dollar was reduced so as to make the ratio 15.988 to 1. By this change the commercial value of the silver dollar exceeded the gold dollar, and logically the silver dollar was not coined and did not circulate. No one cared to avail himself of the free-coinage privilege so long as it took more than a dollar's worth of silver to make a dollar, and Congress in 1873 abolished the silver dollar, which had at no time, since 1834, entered into circulation. The development of trans-continental railways brought the vast mineral fields of the Rockies into market, and the production of silver enormously increased. Very

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

soon after 1873 the commercial value of the two dollars changed places, silver rapidly declining. Then came the cry, for the restoration of free coinage, from the mining interests, supported by that portion of our people that always favors more money. They demanded the restoration of the free-coinage of silver in order that they might take to the mint less than a dollar's worth of silver and receive a legal tender dollar coin therefor. This demand and the attendant political agitation resulted in a compromise measure in 1878, popularly known as the Bland Act, which was enacted into law over the President's veto. Under its provisions the Government became a purchaser of silver bullion, and was obliged to coin from two million to four million dollars worth every month. The coinage aggregated $378,166,795, and was coaxed into circulation by means of silver certificates, now in use, which are "receivable for customs, taxes, and all public dues." The coinage of this vast volume of depreciated silver alarmed the business interests, which sought relief through repeal. The result was another compromise with free-coinage, July 14, 1890, whereby the Government purchased monthly a still larger volume of silver (4,500,000 ounces), stored it instead of coining it, and issued Treasury notes therefor, which were made a full legal tender.

These notes represented a gold dollar's worth of silver at the time of issue, and to that extent were better than the dollar coined under the act of 1878 which was at no time commercially worth its face value. The rapidly growing premium upon bonds lessened the profit upon circulation, and induced a gradual contraction of bank-notes. This contraction disturbed those who believed that currency should keep pace with increasing population and commerce. It alarmed those who always clamor for more money, believing that its plenitude has a stimulating effect upon the prosperity of a people. It was this sentiment that forbade the further redemption of greenbacks, and was instrumental in forcing the passage of the Bland law in 1878, and compelled the acceptance of the compromise act in 1890, instead of absolute repeal. The repeal came in 1893, wrung from an unwilling Congress by the business suffering of the country.

Our fractional silver coin was made subsidiary by Act of 1853 and is now legal tender to an amount not exceeding ten dollars. The following statistics from the Mint Bureau, October 1, 1894, present the statement and the argument as to our silver legislation:

Total coinage of silver dollars under Act of February 28, 1878	**$378,166,793**
Total cost of silver bullion used in such coinage	**308,279,262**

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Seigniorage, or apparent profit	$69,887,531
Bullion value of silver used in such coinage at present prices	186,207,289
Difference between actual cost and bullion value at present	122,071,972
Bullion purchased under Act of July 14, 1890, cost	155,931,002
Market value of such bullion at present market price	107,832,937
Depreciation in value of same	48,098,965

From these statistics it appears that, in addition to the more serious damage to general business and to our credit as a nation, our silver legislation represents a loss to the people of this country, from depreciation in value, of $170,170,937. That sum represents the price of our homage to silver. It is in sharp contrast to the $73,000,000 paid into the Treasury by national banks as a tax on circulation and more than $70,000,000 as a tax on deposits.

Note the inflexibility of this currency. Fixed amounts were arbitrarily added each month, and, however great the stringency, they could not be increased, nor, however great the plethora of money, could they be withheld. And, since the Government can put out money in exchange only for value or in payment for debt, no Government currency can be flexible, elastic and responsive to the varying wants of trade.

Having briefly sketched our currency as it is, let us examine the prominent remedies proposed.

The most formidable and dangerous of the proposed remedies is the free-coinage of silver dollars of present weight and fineness. The ratio has not been changed since 1834, and, since silver dollars refused to circulate as money from that date until their coinage was discontinued in 1873, because they were commercially worth more than gold dollars, it may be asked, Why do gold dollars circulate as money now, when they are commercially worth more than double the value of silver dollars?

The parity of the gold and silver dollar is maintained because it is the declared policy of the Government, formulated in statute law, to maintain it. The Government is in the banking business. It keeps a gold reserve to maintain its credit, and United States notes and Treasury notes are convertible into gold upon presentation. So long as the Government was purchasing 54,000,000 ounces of silver yearly (Act of 1890) and issuing notes therefor redeemable in gold, the country and the world distrusted its ability to maintain a gold basis. This distrust precipitated the panic of 1893. Now silver purchases have ceased, but the Government has of greenbacks, Treas-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ury notes, and national-bank notes (which are convertible into lawful money) in round numbers $700,000,000 of paper money (not to mention the $331,143,301 of silver certificates), all dependent upon about $60,000,000 gold reserve and on the general confidence that the United States will redeem its obligations in as good currency as is known in the world. The credit of the Government maintains the parity. This same greenback that now holds the keys to the gold vaults of the Treasury was worth only thirty-five cents in gold in July, 1864. The credit of the Government has improved. The meagre gold reserve, coupled with the Populistic tendencies of a large portion of our people, raises a distrust, however, which is the chief barrier to renewed prosperity.

The Government is no longer asked to buy the silver product, but to make a market for it by adopting free-coinage. The bullion value of our standard dollar is to-day 49.44 cents. The counterfeiter no longer needs to counterfeit. He can produce a genuine silver dollar, both as to quality as well as to form and to design, and make more than 50 per cent profit by so doing. Our gold dollar contains 23.22 grains of pure gold. Our silver dollar contains practically sixteen times as much pure silver, viz., 371.25 grains. The free-coinage of the present standard dollar containing $371\frac{1}{4}$ grains of pure silver means a dollar commercially worth less than fifty cents, but by the fiat of the Government made to pass for one hundred cents. It means that the seigniorage—that is, the difference between the cost of the silver bullion in open market and the face value of the money into which it is coined—shall hereafter inure to the benefit of individuals and not of the Government. It means that an individual may take $100 worth of silver bullion to the mint, and, coinage free, obtain silver dollars with which to pay $200 worth of debt; and it would thus mean the repudiation of 50 per cent of existing indebtedness. The sagacious instinct of trade would correct this wrong as to future contracts by doubling the price of commodities. It means an inflation of prices without an increase of values. It means a silver basis—silver monometallism. It means that the $500,000,000 of gold now in circulation would go to a premium, would cease to circulate as money, and would simply become a commodity whether coined or uncoined. It means a contraction of our currency equal to the amount of gold which ceased to circulate as money. It means a general unsettling of values, the demoralization of business, a great injustice to present creditors. Just what the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effect would be upon business interests for each business to have one-half of its bills-payable and one-half of its bills-receivable virtually repudiated is a matter for speculation, and I trust the good sense and honesty of the country will leave it in the realms of speculation.

Another remedy for currency ills constantly before Congress is the restoration of State-bank circulation. Currency possesses value according to the area in which it will be accepted in payment of debts. Limit the area and you impair its value. Relegate this power to the forty-four sovereignties that compose this Union and you complicate this already complex question, contravene the spirit and tendency of the age, which seeks closer alliances and broader business relations, compel commerce to halt in its career to respect an artificial obstacle—State lines—and impose upon business a wholly unnecessary embarrassment. You create a new industry—money-changing—and, as in *ante-bellum* times, our State border would be dotted with brokers' offices, prepared, for a commission, to exchange bills issued in one State for those of another. Public interest and, I think, public sentiment will not justify the creation of a currency that is not national in its money functions.

Another proposition for giving the country a safe and adequate currency has recently been formulated by the bankers of Baltimore, acting as an Association. The principles underlying the proposition are neither new nor untried, but derive added importance from the endorsement of so important and conservative a city as Baltimore. The present national-bank law requires the deposit of United States bonds with the United States Treasurer as security for circulation, and allows circulation equal to 90 per cent of the par of such bonds. It provides one central place of redemption,—the United States Treasury,—thus making the notes of all banks alike good throughout the Nation, and it requires the deposit and maintenance with the Treasurer of a 5 per cent redemption fund. It redeems upon presentation the notes of failed banks, and has a prior lien upon their assets including stockholders' liability, to reimburse itself for such payments.

The Baltimore plan proposes to amend the National-Bank Act so as no longer to require Government bonds as security for circulation, but provide a safety-fund instead; to allow banks to issue circulation to 50 per cent of their paid-up, unimpaired capital, and, in an emergency, 75 per cent. All notes of failed banks are to be redeemed by the Government, as under the present law. A guarantee-, or safety-fund, equal to 5 per cent of the outstanding circula-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion is to be accumulated and maintained by gradual taxation upon such circulation. From this fund the Government is to redeem notes of failed banks. The Government also retains a prior lien upon the assets of failed banks, including stockholders' liability, as now provided by law, in order to replenish this safety-fund and protect itself against possible loss. Practically, the only change is to substitute a guarantee-fund for Government bonds as security, the other changes being incidental. The details are open to discussion and improvement, but I believe the principles to be right. The Baltimore plan has nothing to do with the money of ultimate redemption, whether gold, or silver, or greenbacks. It simply provides a bank-note currency redeemable in lawful money. Bank-notes are not legal tender, and should not be. A legal-tender quality would tend to keep them in circulation, prevent their return for redemption, impair their elasticity. A bank-note is a representative of value, by mutual consent performing the office of money, called into existence by some industrial need local to the bank of issue, and should appear and disappear at the beck and nod of such industry.

The principal defect in our present bank-note currency is the want of elasticity. The inability of banks, under existing law, to supply a currency commensurate with the wants of business, has given an opportunity for false theories of finance to come to the front and to command approval. It is not hazarding much to say that, had the National-Bank Act been amended in 1865, as now proposed by the Baltimore plan, and a currency responsive to commercial needs thus made possible, the country would have been spared the greenback heresy and the more substantial and serious injury to credit and business attendant upon silver legislation.

Suppose a bank wants to take out circulation. It is obliged to buy Government bonds as a basis. Four-per-cents are the best investment, and the bank buys $100,000, costing, at present prices, $115,500. The bank is allowed to take out circulation equal to 90 per cent of par—$90,000,—and it must deposit with the United States Treasurer a 5 per cent redemption-fund—$4,500. Thus, by investing and depositing $120,000, the bank is enabled to issue $90,000 circulation. By the operation the bank locks up $30,000 and diminishes its power to aid the public and its customers by such a sum. Could the defect of the National-Bank Act as the basis for a currency system be more glaringly illustrated? The same criticism applies to all currency based upon pledged stock or bonds as security.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The value of the securities must exceed the amount of currency issued, else the security fails. The bank must invest more money in specified securities than the amount of currency it is allowed to issue. Such currency cannot be elastic and responsive to the varying wants of trade. Currency should be issued against all the assets of the bank, not against any specified portion. This is done by giving the note-holder a prior lien upon the assets. Such currency is issued against the credit of the bank, may be increased when commerce calls and will flow back into the vaults of the bank of issue when its service is no longer required. It is elastic. Security and elasticity are the essential qualities of a perfect currency. The currency proposed by the Baltimore plan is secure beyond question, for the Government is required to redeem at once notes of failed banks. The Government would incur no risk of loss on account of such redemption, for the banks would provide and maintain a 5 per cent guarantee-fund from which to make such redemptions. This currency would be perfectly secure without any obligation on the part of the Government other than the application of the guarantee-fund.

Let us examine our own experience since the creation of the national banking system as bearing upon the safety-fund principle. I am indebted to the Comptroller of the Currency for the following:

Average annual circulation of national-banks, 1864 to 1894	$282,801,252
Outstanding circulation of failed national-banks	17,819,541
Cost to general Government on account of national-banks as shown by the books of the comptroller's office	$7,610,169
Additional estimated cost	7,732,914
	$15,343,083
Tax of one-fourth of 1 per cent for thirty-one years	$21,917,093
Tax of one-fifth of 1 per cent for thirty-one years	17,533,674

In regard to this the Comptroller says in reply to my letter:

"These figures verify your conclusion to the effect that a tax on outstanding circulation of one-fifth of 1 per cent would have repaid the cost of the national-banks to the general Government, and also that a tax of one-fourth of 1 per cent would have redeemed the notes of all failed national-banks—in fact, a tax of two-fifths of 1 per cent would have been ample to meet both the cost of that system and the redemption of the notes of failed national-banks."

If an annual tax of two-fifths of 1 per cent would suffice to defray all expense and redeem every note of every failed bank for the past thirty-one years, a 5 per cent guarantee-fund maintained by the banks is certainly ample to protect the Government against loss in guaranteeing the redemption of notes. But as further evidence let me quote the following, also from Comptroller Eckels:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"In further answer to your letter of September 13, you are respectfully advised that the loss to the general Government on account of circulation of failed national-banks, up to January 1, 1894, had there been no bond deposit, would have been $1,139,253. Of this amount $958,247 represents the loss by banks whose trusts are still open and may pay further dividends, thus reducing the amount last named."

Under present laws the Government is bound to redeem all notes of failed banks and is given a prior lien upon the assets of the failed banks to reimburse such payment. With this law in force and without bonds to secure circulation, the Government would during these thirty-one years have lost not exceeding $1,139,253. An annual tax of three-hundredths of 1 per cent upon circulation would have covered this loss. Surely a 5 per cent guarantee-fund maintained by the banks will make circulation perfectly secure.

The experience of thirty-one years of our Nation's history, years replete with many periods of depression, yet, withal, characterized by marvellous growth in population and unprecedented commercial and financial development, certainly constitutes a safe criterion upon which to base legislation for the future.

The State Bank of Ohio, chartered in 1845, having as many as thirty-six branches, illustrated the safety-fund principle. Each branch was liable for the circulation of all, and was required to deposit with the Central Board of Control a 10 per cent guarantee-fund in money or bonds of the State of Ohio or of the United States. This bank was very successful and its note-holders suffered no loss.

The safety-fund principle was proved sound also in the State of New York. A free banking act was passed in 1829. A safety-fund of 3 per cent was provided for the protection of note-holders. By a mistake in legislation this fund was made to apply to all liabilities of failed banks, and hence, when the crash came, was utterly inadequate. For twelve years there was no failure. Millard Fillmore, Comptroller of the State, shows in his report that, had this safety-fund been limited to the protection of note-holders, it would have been ample, with several hundred thousand dollars to spare.

Just such a law as the one proposed by the Baltimore bankers is now in successful operation in the Dominion of Canada, except that the Canadian law allows circulation to the par of unimpaired capital, and the Government assumes no responsibility for the redemption of failed banks' notes beyond the application of the 5 per cent fund. The law has proved eminently successful and satisfactory in Canada. In the light of these facts no one can dispute the safety of the plan.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The deposits in national-banks are to their capital and surplus as $2,255,000,000 to $1,002,000,000. The deposits are more than double the capital and surplus combined, which means that more than two-thirds of the banking business is done upon deposits, and less than one-third upon the money of the stockholder. The national-banks, with over 300,000 stockholders, far from being monopolies, are great co-operative institutions, both as to ownership of stock and deposits. The borrowing season of one industry is offset by the surplus season of another. The extra demand from one section, while marketing its particular staple, is supplied from the surplus money of another section whose crop has been moved or whose special money wants have been supplied. This keeps money moving to and from our distributing money-centres. With our present inflexible currency-system, there is no alternative. Under the proposed law the banks of locality could increase their note-issue whenever the demand for money is active, and when the demand ceases such currency would naturally flow back to the banks' vaults, awaiting a renewed demand. This would in a measure save the expense of transporting money to and from money-centres and would tend to prevent the congestion of money in our large cities, with abnormally low rates and a tendency to speculation; and, on the other hand, it would tend to reduce the high rates for money in rural localities. An elastic currency is indispensable in time of panic. The only elasticity of our present currency-system consists in the auxiliary credits.

Ninety-two per cent of all the business transacted through banks in the United States is consummated by means of checks, drafts and other forms of credit. Hence, when credit is withheld, a money-stringency is easily created. Reliable data show that certified checks, cashiers' checks, certificates of deposit from banks, due-bills from individuals and corporations, all in round amounts, intended to pass from hand to hand as money and added to clearing-house certificates used in settling bank balances, were utilized to the extent of more than $100,000,000 during the recent currency-famine. This illustrates the defect in our currency-law, for which the Baltimore bankers have suggested the remedy. Under their proposed law, the banks would have met the situation with an increased issue of notes.

The free-silver interests criticise this plan severely, as they will criticise any plan that does not utilize silver. They have shrewdly utilized the evenly balanced condition of political parties and the popular clamor for more money to shape our monetary legislation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

since 1878; and, when a commercial crisis resulted from our suicidal silver policy, they maintained a deadlock in the United States Senate until commercial disaster and universal distress forced a vote and the repeal of the Act of 1890.

Another objection is that note-holders will have a prior lien upon the assets of a failed bank. So they have now by the National-Bank Act. Nearly all our State laws contain the same provision. The prior claim of note-holders has long been recognized in Great Britain. It is a well-settled principle of currency legislation, and was well settled long prior to the passage of the National-Bank Act. It gives note-holders an advantage over depositors, says the critic. He is entitled to it. Currency is the ingredient that assimilates all business transactions, reduces all barter to a common unit, and permits set-off and payment of balances. The claim of a depositor is wholly a private contract, and rests upon an entirely different basis. No man deposits money in a bank because the Government has given it a charter, but because of the standing of the bank.

As to the objection that banks would be organized in remote places solely for the purpose of issuing circulation,—remember that all circulation is issued by the Comptroller, who would enforce wholesome restrictions. All provisions of the National-Bank Act as to payment of capital in cash, verified reports, and expert examinations, would still apply. The Comptroller has power to withhold a charter if the character of the incorporators, the locality, or any good reason convinces him that good banking is not the purpose of the organization.

It is a recognized duty of the Government to supply its citizens with money which possesses debt-paying power, which when tendered by a debtor to a creditor must be accepted as extinguishing the debt. The Constitution reserves to Congress the sole power to coin money and to regulate the value thereof, and with the coining of gold and silver, I think, the Government's money-function should end. Our own experience and the experience of other nations prove the wisdom of leaving the issue of auxiliary currency, paper money which does not possess legal-tender quality, under proper regulations, to the banks. Our Government's credit would not then be measured by its gold reserve. The national-bank note exemplifies the true principle of paper money, and, relieved from the unreasonable restrictions and given the elasticity embodied in the safety-fund principle, I believe it will prove a boon to our commercial interests, and relieve us from vexatious and injurious currency-agitation. A. B. HEPBURN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DEATH OF THE CZAR AND THE PEACE OF EUROPE.

THE norm of peace in Europe has been stated at a maximum of twenty years. This is not borne out by the facts. Taking the last three hundred years and counting only such tremendous conflicts as the Thirty Years' War, the Franco-Spanish War, the Wars in the Netherlands, the War of the Spanish Succession, those of the Austrian Succession, the Seven Years' War, the wars of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars, the Crimean War, the Franco-Sardinian-Austrian War, the Prusso-Austrian-Italian War, the Franco-German War, the Turko-Russian War, there appear to have been more than one hundred years when the business of the world was killing. Should we count such minor conflicts as the wars of Grecian Independence and Italian Unification, the wars of the partition of Poland, the many wars of Russia and Austria with the Turks, those of the Scandinavian nations, and the numerous civil wars and revolutions everywhere, there would be a record of more than two hundred years of actual fighting in three centuries. The periods between great wars vary from one year to forty. Apart from the Malthusian theory, the most solid comfort to be derived from the rehearsal of all this slaughter lies in the fact that wars tend to grow farther apart, as they grow more potentially terrible. We may not be on the eve of a general disarmament, nor indeed, despite the example of the English-speaking nations, quite near an era of international arbitration; but it may be confidently claimed that the periods of war will be vastly fewer, and the intervals between wars markedly longer than heretofore. This means less waste of human life and less infliction of human suffering; for what exterminates armies is long and arduous campaigning, not general engagements, whatever their list of casualties.

In a certain sense, armies are provocative of peace, not war. It is the statesman or the journalist-politician who brings on war; it is the soldier who is compelled to conquer peace. The latter is the passive element, the former the active, however inverted these rôles may appear. If any one dreads war, it is the soldier of modern times;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not because he lacks stomach, for every young knight longs to win his spurs, but because he knows, if he has ever seen it, what war means. The mercenary swashbuckler who lived on war is, happily, a creature of the past, unless his mantle has fallen on the over-excitable members of the press. The citizen to-day protects his own fireside; and no one prays for peace more ardently than he upon whom the terrors of its rupture are first and most heavily to fall.

At no period of history has the world been so well equipped for war as to-day; at no period has every one more honestly desired peace. It is always among the possibilities that a spark may set the structure aflame; but, though it would burn with a fiercer heat and a shorter, it is not so quickly kindled as of yore. There is a disposition on every side to be less thin-skinned, which clearly makes for peace; and if the Socialist movement will occupy the attention of European statesmen at home so that they may have less leisure to brood over foreign encroachments or diplomatic provocations, then Socialism is *pro tanto* a blessing.

There is, in passing, a disposition to rob Socialism of the credit of such good as it is actually doing, by dwelling too much on the harm which its so-called offshoot, Anarchism, occasionally does; but the fact remains that Socialism, despite its rather disputatious congresses, is only the natural protest of the many to the arrogant rule of the few, and that it is, on the whole, gradually accomplishing the good which our Republic set out to do—to help the peoples govern themselves. In the good old *ante-bellum* days, when eighty per cent of all the property in the United States was owned by poor men, say those worth from five hundred to five thousand dollars each, Socialism, let alone Anarchism, could find small footing with us. Now that the Republic has become a plutocracy, and that eighty per cent of its property is owned by a small group, whose numbers are about as one to two thousand of the population, there is a better breeding-ground for both lawful and lawless creeds. What the event will be at home, where our decentralization can barely put down riots, it is hard to say.

But this is wandering. In view of the death of the Czar, what are the prospects of the interruption of a peace which has enabled all the Governments to prepare so stupendously for war? Every nation has its internal troubles, financial and social; but, after all, the question put is the only international one, and on its answer depends the happiness of nearly every household in Europe.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Alexander III. of Russia will go down to future generations as a broad-minded man whose every instinct was firmly set for peace. In the thirteen years that he reigned, he earned the growing respect of the whole civilized world, and it is sad, indeed, that his life should have been cut short of even fifty years. For us Americans it is hard to appreciate the inner economics of Russia; but few of us know what the ignorant, heterogeneous population of the vast Empire is; and fewer can judge the difficulties incident to raising such a mass to a level with other nations. Whatever may be said of the home institutions, perhaps the Russian Empire may be gauged by the fact that more knees were bent in earnest prayer for the Great White Father than there could possibly be for any other man upon whom Death might set his mark. Despite Nihilism, Alexander the man and monarch was beloved; and, so far as his influence on foreign affairs was concerned, there is but one voice. He will be remembered as a ruler of exceptional common-sense, of quiet firmness, and of strong statesman-like views. An autocrat ruling over more than one hundred millions of souls, what he has said and done has had unusual weight.

In personal character and bearing he was strongly a Slav, and very devoted to Russia. Slavic methods of thought are not ours, and with equal intelligence and honesty it is not easy for a Slav and a Western European Aryan to understand each other in other than mere society problems. Keenly jealous of his prestige, it was largely the exclusion of Russia from what became the Triple Alliance that made him show the *rapprochement* for France which has been so eagerly coveted and so much exaggerated in Paris; but, for all this, there is no Germanophobia to be detected in his attitude. In his simple home-life, in his earnest habits of work, in his education, he was more like a German than a Gaul. He desired so to place himself as to have his voice in European leadership, which the Triple Alliance threatened to monopolize.

In frame the Czar was, in his youth, big, sound and athletic. He was fond of exhibiting his strength. He could, it is said, tear a full pack of cards in two, bend a ruble-piece, break a horse-shoe, or force in any locked door. Simple of habit, he had done no more of court ceremony than he must; and he keenly enjoyed plain fare and real toil. Like Gladstone, he used an axe; he would mow the grass on his lawn; his ministers have often found him hanging pictures or doing joiner-work. He was sincerity itself. Attentive to business, he rarely used a secretary, but jotted down his observations on state

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

papers in his own hand. Though he received little and went out still less, he kept abreast with all that was going on in his own court and the world at large; and he dearly loved to hear the gossip of the day.

He was not a *gourmet*, but rather a hearty eater, preferring the plain Russian dishes, such as cabbage-soup. He was unapt to pay heed to his medical advisers. In his family-circle amiable and affectionate, kindly to inferiors and domestics, he was sober and somewhat stiff outside. While full of warm feeling, he found it difficult to utter words of praise; but he was able to give vent to his displeasure in very forcible Russian. For years he lived a life of worry:—the nation's financial straits, fear of attempts on his life, a natural habit of brooding over wrongs, care for the Czarina, who has been something of a nervous invalid. No one but his physician knew of the fatal disease under which he labored, and there was no little complaint in the court and army-circles that the Czar had given up the saddle, so that he no longer took part in military reviews, and that he gave each year less and less heed to palace-ceremonial.

The new Czar, Nicholas II., was born in 1868. By those who have known him informally, in his travels and elsewhere, he is said, while lacking the Romanoff physique, to be as strong as he is earnest and truthful, given to a fondness for scientific study, and interested in all that pertains to the good of Russia. More modern than his father, he is none the less pacific in habit of thought so far as the outside world is concerned; but, above all, he has the amelioration of Russia at heart, especially in what relates to the welfare of the middle classes and peasantry.

It is a tremendous responsibility which rests on the shoulders of the twenty-six-year-old successor to the throne of all the Russias; and, however sturdy may be his mental and moral equipment, he has not had the training which only years bring—years of trial, of danger, of yearning to do, and of failure in seeking to do, the right thing. We have had in the neighboring Empire a sample of what exuberant youth can be guilty of in unnecessary excess of inexperienced zeal; and we know that there is oftener wisdom in leaving undone than there is in doing. The one is the silver of speech, the other the gold of silence. Whether Nicholas II. will err in sins of commission or omission, and how he will fill the throne of Alexander III., cannot yet be said.

The multiplicity of serious questions for him to face is appalling; and each of them is laden with the potentiality of peace or war.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Just what his personal sympathies are the public does not know. How he will adjust himself to the Triple Alliance and to its complement, the *entente cordiale* of Russia and France, with neutral England and her huge new appropriation for the navy as an enigmatical background, is yet to appear. How he looks upon the traditional Russian aspirations to the Balkan peninsula; how deeply he is imbued with Panslavism; how he views the Russian possibilities in the Corean war; how far he may desire to push forward Russian influence in the States abutting on India—all these are questions no one can answer for a while. Nicholas himself can scarcely be clear in the matter. It would seem that the internal economics of his vast Empire are complicated enough to keep his mind for some years from international entanglements. It is said that his father devoted much time to training the young Czar into his own method of thinking. He was scrupulous in selecting his governor, an old-fashioned, rigid, pious man. He watched over his associates. He strove to make him worthy of the crown. When a Nihilist bomb placed Alexander III. on the throne, the same dark anticipations were indulged in which confront us now. It was thought that the new Czar might be urged on by the young nobles' war-party to do some part which would interfere with general peace; but the strong, even current of his bearing was through his whole career one of the guarantees of quiet. May it be so with Nicholas!

There has been some recent prophesying of war, or, rather, strong hinting of its possibility. Some of this talk is idle, some of it vicious. To gag a few of the journalists would indeed be a public blessing. Such phrases as the "contagious influence of war," "the lust for slaying," "the intoxication which the sight of successful campaigns has on nations," and "the human tiger has tasted blood once more and the appetite grows with eating"—are surely noxious, even if flippant. If war is contagious, and European nations must rush to arms on account of the Corean struggle, why did our Civil War, which every week ate up more men than the entire campaign will cost Japan and China, not breed a conflict in Europe? Though wars are largely sentimental, nations do not plunge into them without a cause, real or imagined. Luckily the level-headed journalists do not indulge in such flourishes. I do not look for war out of any conditions now existing. There is no reason why the old Bulgarian sore should be prodded into activity so as to poison the political blood of Europe. Madagascar ought not to do so. The most proxi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mate set of factors which might so eventuate lie hidden in the Corean struggle and concern Russia and England.

Our British cousins very naturally look askance at everything Russia may do; that she is their prime opponent makes her course appear crooked, if not ignoble, in every instance; and the fact that Lord Rosebery paid a handsome personal tribute to the Czar in his Sheffield speech does not conflict with this popular mistrust of the Muscovite. But Russia has as much right to extend the borders of her garments as Great Britain has; and John Bull is not habitually slow to run up his flag on any available spot he may safely grab. Russia does no more.

Despite society imitation of her ways, there seems, at the moment, to be a curious antagonism to England manifested by all the powers, save Italy. It is hard to trace this feeling to its source; but such *gauche* incidents as Lord Rosebery's recent reference to Agincourt do not tend to decrease it in France, any more than the irritating delays in the Madagascar business, or the continued occupation of Egypt. While there does not exist fuel enough to fan into a war-blaze even with France, Great Britain stands alone. Germany, in the event of war, would scarce lift a finger to aid her, and has lately been coquetting with Gallic susceptibilities; in fact, many people in France have begun to look on the loss of Alsace and Lorraine as ancient history. Thus Great Britain cannot boast an ally, and has the three strongest powers in a certain sense against her, a fact of which the recent refusal to listen to her suggestion for intervention between China and Japan was but a sign; and it is not improbable that, should Russia wish to seize a big strip of Manchuria, so as to straighten her Siberian railroad, she would be aided not only by Manchurian hostility to China, but also by the silence of Germany and Austria, who are not unwilling to see her Christianizing influence grow in those benighted lands, and by the consent of France, which might want Russia to wink at an increase of her own holding in Tonquin.

All this, added to the fact that Great Britain, while she can outweigh Russia by her Pacific squadron, cannot compete with her on land, seems to place the settlement of the Corean question rather in St. Petersburg than in London. That Japan shall not occupy Corea in permanency herself will surely be the insistence of both Russia and England; but if Russia saw fit to claim the right to guide the destinies of that peninsula, it might be hard for Japan alone to prevent it; and Japan and England will scarcely join hands. Russian

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

diplomacy is keen; and it is altogether probable that in dealing with the question so vital to her, Russia would know how to satisfy Japan by consenting to her taking her reward out of another part of China. Should this be so, England is scarcely in a position to do more than protest; and in case she demanded her slice, some territorial compensation near Hong-Kong and Shanghai would silence her objections.

The position of Great Britain was pointed out in THE FORUM for October by Dr. Geffcken. We Anglo-Saxons are wont to overrate ourselves. Inasmuch as our self-esteem has for centuries been coupled with the true colonizing fervor and with the habit of putting in big licks, the quality has been helpful, not only to us but to the world at large; but when we use this quality as an international yard-stick, we are not always happy in our figuring. We are impatient at being judged by a "foreigner." M. Paul Bourget, despite his generous keenness, makes many of us writhe. So with the English in matters international. They jeer at the estimates by foreigners of their position in the world's economy; and yet, to arrive at the truth of the military situation—and all politics is to a degree measured by the length and quality of the sword-blade—you may not overlook the conservative utterances of the leading continental authorities. We are all too provincial "to see oursel's as others see us."

Here I wish to maintain that the best American is he who has been fortunate enough to see the world and to be able to gauge both his country's faults and virtues by the measure of many other nations. Such a man returns home with a higher appreciation of and love for America, just because he sees her shortcomings. I do not believe in the expatriated American; but I do believe in him who intelligently views the world, and judges his country by the greater standard. An American yard is not six feet long, as we are fain to urge; but it is a good thirty-six inches—which is more than every other nation can boast.

No one disputes the greatness of England. It is only necessary to travel with her citizens to the climes where they civilize and broaden the world all round its vast circumference, to feel that were you not an American you would wish to be a Briton. She is indeed a mighty element in the welfare of the earth. But other nations have learned her ways while she has not learned theirs. Anglomania is not all imitation; it teaches many a lesson; and it is a serious question whether England can continue to be as relatively great as she has been. Continental nations have grown to be colonizers, and are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gradually acquiring the knack of it. A yet more trenchant idea is Dr. Geffcken's "key of the situation: namely, that the British Empire as it stands is *safe* only so long as it has supremacy at sea." This word cuts the knot of the problem. It is not only the pre-eminence of England, but perhaps her safety, which might be at stake should she drift into a war. The battleground of England is the Mediterranean. She must hold this or forfeit her high-road to India, her control of the Suez Canal, her immense and easy superiority in commerce. Russia has managed to slip some vessels through the Bosphorus; should this continue, she might yet gain a slight say-so in the Mediterranean; and with France as ally, and Italy neutral, England might be put to it to do herself justice. Still Russia knows that she can best hamper England in the Orient; and she will not be lightly persuaded to try conclusions elsewhere.

John Bull is wise. He stands alone, but he gets rated at a premium, and he knows how far he may go; and in the Oriental question he will not insist too much. Were it possible for Great Britain and Japan to join hands, the union would outweigh Russia in the pending questions. But as she did in 1861, England, prompted by commerce, has now chosen the losing side, and such a union is scarcely on the cards; it is vastly more probable that Russia will be able to play into the hands of Japan, enough to avert her suspicions and satisfy her demands, without losing her own hold on what she aims to get: a better climatic harbor than Vladivostok. Russia can bide her time; and when her trans-Siberian railroad shall have got finished, she will be the power of the Pacific Orient. It is, moreover, true that Russia makes friends of the peoples she subdues; a thing in which Great Britain often fails. Though it is probable that the result of the Corean war will extensively modify commercial relations with the East, and will rub off some of the cuticle if not lop off some of the limbs of monstrous China, there is no reason why there need be any immediate change in the world's political centre of gravity. Japan has rightfully become a member of the sisterhood of nations; but she will play for a generation a modest part, except in the far Orient.

We Americans can but hope that Great Britain will retain her present position; it is a healthful one for the world's peace; but other nations are making gigantic strides in British specialties. So long as her navy can hold head to any two others—a matter of present doubt—and is not too much scattered, she will maintain herself;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but she must beware of any complications which shall call for what other nations would deem a respectable land force. She has none. And what is more, when a few hours' fighting can entirely disable a fleet, as we have just seen done in the Yellow Sea, who shall predict the outcome of any naval encounter? It is no longer the old day of gunpowder and gin, of boarding-cutlass and human brawn: accident is king; and one lucky shot may disable a battleship full of mettle enough to win a kingdom.

Between France and England there always has been and always will be a series of little miffs; or, to use the French phrase, a succession of *moues;* and it needs more than this to breed serious trouble. Neither has anything to gain by war; the Gaul seeks it no more than the Briton; and, though the press on both sides of the Channel is full of little irritating thrusts, each will go a long way to avoid it. Could France be certain of active Russian support, a small incentive might suffice to make her cast her glove at Great Britain; but the Double Alliance is not of the strongest; and nothing but a clash on other ground between lion and bear would induce Russia to join in a French attack on her island neighbor. Bar France and Russia, Great Britain has no immediate prospects of drifting into war.

The mercurial German Emperor is again dealing in surprises. Since Bismarck's retirement, nothing so pictorial has happened as the dismissal of Caprivi and Eulenberg. If William II. could have his way, he would be a Barbarossa, with all the accompanying mediævalisms. But this is his habit, and some months since he surprised us by again "sidling up" to France. Alsace-Lorraine is claimed to have become Germanized—indeed, part of the population is so; and though, at the outset of this Emperor's career, folks feared an outbreak of the bellicose Hohenzollern blood, or an error leading to equally grave results, he has now sobered down into a peaceful monarch. Socialism to-day in Germany is a factor in the peace problem. There exists no danger from her. The Emperor will be kept busy with his new team of ministers—behind whom he may himself hold the reins—for more months than he calculates. Poor old Bismarck now has a companion on the shelf. One can imagine his grim smile. Will he see a third one added to the row?

France will not attack Germany. Hatred used to be a good reason for wars; and a *casus belli* can be found hanging on even the smallest political disagreement. For twenty years "*Revanche*" has been thought to be such a reason; but the oncoming generations cry

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"*Revanche!*" less lustily than their sires. Hatred of the bilious Briton, or revenge for a beating a quarter-century old, will not suffice to breed the feeling which generates war, even in Gallic breasts. Germany and Russia have no cause of quarrel, proximate or indeed within several removes; and it may be said that Austria-Hungary and Italy are not in a position to take the initiative in any question. They are mere lieutenants of the ponderous German captain. Italy would scarcely jeopardize her standing in the Triple Alliance by adding her fleet to England's.

There is no safety in predicting any turn in a game in which a youthful monarch holds a strong hand; but, though many rumors have been running around about the new Czar, Nicholas II., there seems no probability of his undertaking any inflammable rôle. Russia has so much more to gain by peace than war. Barely a third of her army has the new small-bore rifle, and it will be two years before the other regiments are so equipped. Her revenues are none too great. Russia needs her money for the trans-Siberian railway; and she ought not to blow it out of the mouths of big guns. No doubt there is tension in many of the international relations; but that is always present; and diplomats are growing more reasonable. It is probable that what has been said of the character of Nicholas is in the main true; and this should lead him to follow in the footsteps of his illustrious father and make Russia still the dictator of peace.

No man will be rash enough to say that war may not come. Every one of the continents has spots where an accidental outbreak, the blunder of an over-zealous servant, may work such a hardship, actual or ideal, to some great power as shall call for an excited demand for reparation. It is then that cool heads, if not thick skins, are in demand; and it is then that the effervescence of journalists in search of circulation or notoriety does most harm. The human animal, according to his kind, is the silliest of all animals, if we measure him rightly: I know of no other that is capable of such irrational freaks; and it is on these that peace or war hangs by a hair. But, to resume, I do not believe, despite all the talk, that there is in the present status of the world a set of conditions which will lead to early war. The sentiment of the leading rulers, statesmen and journalists does not trend that way.

THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STATUS AND FUTURE OF THE WOMAN SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT.

THE argument for Woman Suffrage stands very much where it stood before the proposed Woman-Suffrage Amendment was rejected by the recent New York Constitutional Convention; and yet not altogether. The action of the convention indeed has thrown no new light upon it, but the lively discussion aroused outside the convention has wonderfully shaken up ideas, and has, so to speak, redistricted them according to many new party lines.

In this discussion, moreover, many latent ideas, of great yet unsuspected influence upon public consciousness, have been dragged into the open, and compelled to submit to tests of validity. Chief among such latent ideas is, naturally, the conviction of the universal, necessary, and irreversible inferiority of women. This idea was formerly patent enough,—indeed, has only just begun to disappear from the surface of society, and from the front rank of all social arrangements and of much philosophic theory. Nowadays, however, amid the general softening of manners and the spread of kindlier feeling, many men seemed to have almost forgotten that they were superior, until startled by the demand to accord to women the one seal of equality in a democratic community, namely, equal suffrage.

Nevertheless,—and this is most interesting to notice,—this conviction of the inferiority of women, though it be really the gist of all the opposition made by men to their enfranchisement, has been expressed only occasionally in the recent debates. A politeness which, in the premises, is fully as great an innovation as is the suffrage claim itself, has dominated the discussion and shifted the argument. Not contempt for women, but solicitude for the welfare of the State, is most frequently alleged as the reason for refusing suffrage.

Now in discussions in other countries on other propositions to extend the franchise, this question has been asked,—but then it has always meant: "Is it an advantage to the State that large masses of its population remain within its borders as aliens, unable to contribute the least share toward moulding social policy, prevented from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

having the faintest articulate opinion about the selection of public officials, one of whose most important functions is to reflect, measure, and express public opinion?" But when this inquiry is made about women, it is intended to mean, at its best, "What proof have you that women will 'reform' any of the undesirable situations, which have been so plentifully created by the political genius of men?"

When Senator Carey, of Wyoming, was invited by the Suffrage Committee of the recent New York Constitutional Convention to describe the working of equal suffrage in his State, almost the only question asked him by the committee was, "Have the women done anything to put down the gambling houses?" The Senator observed that gambling, being the characteristic vice of a mining community, could be outgrown only as the community became more civilized, and, in the diffusion of civilizing agencies, the four thousand woman voters of the State bore their full share. Moreover, they did not gamble themselves, and as they did vote, in this way at least they undoubtedly diminished the percentage of gambling voters. Still the question was repeated, until at last Mr. Carey, growing impatient, exclaimed, "I will tell you one effect of woman suffrage: Wyoming is the only State in the Union where the women school-teachers receive as high salaries as they would if they were men."

Women, too apt to be impressed by the dicta of their superiors, become themselves shy of urging their own advantage as a reason for their own enfranchisement. They prefer to promise that all sorts of moral improvements shall immediately follow upon this: that drunkenness shall cease, that gambling shall be abolished, that licentiousness shall be purified out of existence. I wish not to be behind any one in desiring the moral improvement of society, and I am also convinced that in many, though indirect, ways this will be furthered by the enfranchisement of women. Yet when, through modesty or an excess of caution, I hesitate to pronounce as certain anything which has not yet been proved, and refuse to rest the claim for woman suffrage upon the capacity of women for missionary work, I am accused[1] of giving away the whole case, and relying upon "arguments which would not convince a corporal's guard"! But when before, in the history of the world, was a right to citizenship made to depend on readiness to reform the vices of other people?

President Eliot observed in THE FORUM for October:

[1] New York "Tribune" review of "Common Sense Applied to Woman Suffrage."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Universal suffrage prolongs in the United States the effect of universal education; for it stimulates all citizens throughout their lives to reflect on problems outside the narrow circle of their private interests and occupations, to read about public questions, to discuss public characters, and to hold themselves ready in some degree to give a rational account of their political faith. The duties of republican citizenship, rightly discharged, constitute in themselves a prolonged education, which effectively supplements the work of schools and colleges."

Of this "prolonged education" women are as universally deprived, as, in this country, men are universally admitted to it. What the result is of training women to believe that their business is to be personal,—always personal, nothing but personal,—and that the care of personal interests is their specialty, any one may easily observe who takes the trouble to observe women or to talk with them. Not "politics" alone is excluded from their mental horizon, but all public interests; and, if the public interests of the day, still more those of former days, which constitute history. Forbidden, at least officially and theoretically, to join in the social movements constantly organizing to produce real effects, women feel under no obligation to attain the exact knowledge which is required in order to produce effects. They lose, or never gain, a sense of reality beyond that of the members of their family or of their own interests, or feelings, or sensations. They remain indifferent to all knowledge beyond that of the concrete maxims necessary to carry on their daily private concerns, and are absolutely oblivious to general principles.

It is needless to add that there are many women, who, having been swept into currents of influence other than those of the general social situation, do not do any of these things, but quite the reverse. The women whose social instincts have thus developed spontaneously, and in the absence of the habitual and appropriate stimuli to development, are usually quite alive to the value of political rights, and are largely represented among the 400,000 women who recently demanded these in New York. Those who are not so alive, who continue to maintain the curious fiction that, though engaging in most useful public work, they are still remaining within the traditional private sphere of women, or that the branch of public affairs called political is something radically different from every other form, and especially from those enterprises in which the women engage,—such women decline at present to demand political rights for themselves, and sometimes, even, condemn with considerable asperity the other women who try to do so.

Once, women were not taught how to read, because pronounced forever incompetent for the priesthood. Now, though much more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

indirectly and less crudely, incompetency on the part of women for the franchise, for any share in the supreme social function, becomes a symbol for general unfitness, and for at least relative unfitness, in *all* social functions. This unfitness does not in reality exist. Moreover, every day it is less and less supposed to exist. The symbol, therefore, becomes a fraud,—a fraud organized in the very centre of our political system, and established as a fundamental part of the social machinery for the maintenance of justice. It is in vain to declare that it is of no consequence who administers justice, or who chooses the officials for administration. On the very threshold stands the question, Who has the right to conduct the administration? Violation of this initial right vitiates every step that follows. And are not these steps sufficiently vitiated, confused, demoralized? Can any citizen of New York to-day pretend that rights are so well maintained, that justice is so amply secured, through the administration of public affairs exclusively by men, that the fitness and sufficiency of men for popular government is conclusively demonstrated, and—by implication—that women are proved superfluous, and therefore unfit?

The revelations of universal corruption and of no less universal cowardice which are to-day appalling New York prove that the sense of justice which is the foundation of civic as of private virtue has become, for the time being, generally weakened, perverted, or altogether destroyed. It has been forgotten that it was as shameful to pay, as to receive, a bribe; as criminal to submit to blackmail, as to levy it; not more scandalous to carry on a conspiracy for crime than to maintain a conspiracy of silence by which crime should be condoned. The millions of money wasted, the widows terrorized, the orphans robbed, are yet an insignificant calamity beside the social moral rottenness which has rendered possible this prolonged, insidious, insolent criminality. A great shame has fallen upon New York. The splendid city stands like Phryne before the Areopagus, and the Public Prosecutor has snatched away her mantle to reveal,—not beauty, but hideousness!

In all the long roll-call of her misdeeds; in the dull selfishness which has counselled indifference to the commonwealth that private fortune might be aggrandized; in the stupidity which found a nobler field for ambition on the race-track or in the yacht-club, than in the public affairs of a magnificent realm; in the dense partisanship which has threatened to atrophy great parties into factions; in the vulgar greed which sees in the wealth of a metropolis only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a field for plunder; in the reckless dishonesty which has tainted all administration; in the corrupt partnership with the criminal; in the brutal oppression of the innocent; in the brutal neglect of the helpless; in the perversion of all the machinery of justice toward the perpetration of injustice;—what part has been borne by women?

None! They, and they alone, are innocent of all these crimes and guiltless of all this disgrace. All that can be charged against women is that, excluded from responsibility, they have failed to feel responsible; that, forbidden to take any part in public affairs, they have usually obeyed the prohibition; that, trained to look upon New York as an assemblage of shopping-places, they have had no lofty ideal for their native city; that, encouraged or compelled to be apathetic themselves, they have infected with their own apathy husbands, and brothers, and sons; that, helpless to combine, they have often underbid their fellow-workmen; that, shut out from the sphere of public rights, they have often had feeble convictions of right or justice; and that when pressed too hard from above, or tempted too strongly from below, they have often abandoned their rocky foothold of ill-paid work, to slip into the sea of corruption seething around it, and added their own bodies to the putrescence!

In a democratic society, the government is the condensed expression of the collective activities of society. Of these activities it discharges the supreme function, the maintenance of justice. In doing so, it reflects and measures with considerable precision the moral sense of the community which chooses the government, elects its officials, prescribes their administration, and ratifies their laws.

But, in existing democratic societies, the activities of women are not included among those which government is expected to express. It follows, therefore, either that women are not members of society, or that the fundamental system of the State does not do, nor intend to do, what it professes to do. Yet by unanimous consent women *are* recognized as members of society, practically equal to men, notwithstanding tradition and theory. Thus both terms of the contradiction are simultaneously accepted. Again: according to the democratic idea, all the recognized elements of the social organism are enabled, at least to a minimum degree, to secure representation of their thoughts, wills, and respective situations in social institutions, and in social movements. If, in the democratic State, units whose force, intelligence, and virtue fall below the minimum continue to secure representation for their thoughts and wills, while units who possess this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minimum, and much beyond, are excluded,—the fundamental principle of the State is contradicted. The State is thereby weakened.

The contradiction has been pointed out often enough during the last fifty years. Less often have been noted the ways, increasingly conspicuous, in which the weakness becomes manifest. Accustomed, in spite of profession to the contrary, to see government by all really carried on as government by some, men learn to acquiesce in the assumption of government by few. They may learn even to consider this a convenience; and it is true that sometimes the streets are then better swept. But governments do not exist chiefly in order to sweep streets, but to maintain justice among men. Though an oligarchy should sweep the streets to perfection, it could never condone its original crime of usurpation; and the poisonous influence of conscious crime would finally ruin even its power of street-sweeping. Exclusion of women from representation, after the democratic principle has been proclaimed, constitutes a contradiction of principle as positive as would the similar exclusion of any class of men.

Two questions arise: Why do not all women equally feel the pressure of this injustice? and, Why do some among them even protest against the "burden" of the suffrage? And what do those other women, who continue to press the claim for political equality, propose at this moment to do about it?

As to feminine opposition to political responsibility,—the claim to equality of position and opportunity made by the suffragists is based on a potential equality between the sexes, which is formally disallowed in existing social institutions, and often converted into an actual inequality under their powerfully distorting influence. Women whose capacities are cramped or atrophied by such influence suffer one kind of wrong. Women whose capacities have more or less escaped this influence, and attained a level of practical equality with those of men, suffer another kind of wrong, when they are forcibly maintained in a position of formal inferiority. And with both classes of women society suffers, by the loss of abilities, atrophied or repressed, and by the maintenance of assertions which even cursory observation shows to be untrue.

After the objection to citizenship as a "burden,"—perhaps as dangerous a sign as any of a widespread mental effeminacy and demoralization,—comes the second objection, that women should not vote, or do not want to vote, lest they might be outvoted by the "ignorant" and "illiterate." It is hard to see how any one can feel

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the force of this objection, and yet remain indifferent to the actual circumstances, in which women are being outvoted by ignorance and illiteracy all the time,—and that without the possibility of redress. There are, however, absolutely no facts upon which to base this oft-repeated objection. So far, wherever women have had the opportunity for full suffrage, they have exercised their right energetically, and evidently under the stimulus of the consciousness that unless they did so they might be outvoted, and men elected of whom they did not approve, or measures carried out to which they were opposed. Where women have been negligent of partial suffrage,—as sometimes, though far from always, in regard to schools,—it is because they have seen no issue at stake which necessitated their taking sides. They have not yet developed to the full stature of citizenship that implies the assumption of all responsibilities which fall of right to the citizen. Imperfect development of citizens constitutes one of the most formidable dangers of a democratic State.

The prevalence of misconceptions, the careless avowals of weakness and ignorance, the thoughtless inconsistency of current statement, all combine to show that the first need in regard to the enfranchisement of women, as of men, is education. Political education cannot really be secured without possession of political rights. Nevertheless, in default of these, the hope, the steady intention of obtaining them will often serve.

The work of the women who intend to continue the systematic agitation for the suffrage in the State of New York will be now mainly directed to efforts for the systematic political education of women. Suffrage leagues, as hitherto organized, have been apt to address themselves too little to education, too much to "campaign speeches." It is indeed difficult to persuade average citizens, either male or female, to study anything for which they have no immediate use. When the utility becomes obvious, the energy and interest are promptly forthcoming. The women of Colorado organized, all over the State, clubs for the study both of politics and of political science. The effective assistance, which, at the last election, the women of Colorado lent to the work of defeating the blatherskite candidate for Governor, shows an excellent practical result of such studies.

In New York City, curious object-lessons upon "women in politics" have been offered by the organization of groups of women,—many of whom had pronounced themselves "anti-suffragists,—to aid in the work of a reform election, under the leadership of men who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had previously opposed, with considerable emphasis, the immixture of women in politics. Women who had been told that they should not vote were now urged to instruct men how to vote, or at all events to stand by them and see that they did their duty in voting. No more theoretically incongruous but practically admirable situation could have been devised than this, which followed so promptly upon the defeat of the claim by women to be allowed to exercise the rights of citizenship. It was a complete give-away,—and the most elaborate explanations can make nothing else out of it.

Out of this movement seems destined to rise some permanent organization of women in the city of New York, devoted to the interests of municipal affairs, and to the problem of showing how much public, *i.e.*, political work, women can accomplish *without* the franchise. The movement itself is in direct filiation with the movement started last spring, to secure a suffrage amendment from the Constitutional Convention. It is at this very moment assuming a permanent form, and planning a work intermediate between that of the old suffrage leagues and of the numerous organized groups of women, who, in one way or the other, as innocently as M. Jourdain, already speak the prose [of politics] without knowing it. It is extremely desirable to form a closely-knit yet widely ramifying organization of clubs for such meetings, properly systematized and sobered down to real work, throughout the State. A most famous historical model is offered for such clubs, in the Committees of Correspondence organized by Samuel Adams in Massachusetts in 1772, after the suppression of the provincial assembly had left the colony speechless. It was through the concerted action of five of these committees that the Boston Tea Party was successfully carried out.

Committees organized by the League for political education would have a fourfold work: 1, to create a focus of suffrage sentiment, by means of clubs meeting once or twice a month, for the study and discussion of current politics, of political institutions, of history, and, for the better educated, even of political economy; 2, to watch over the selection of candidates to the State Legislature from each Assembly and Senatorial district, to ascertain their views in regard to equal suffrage, and to endeavor as far as possible to create a public sentiment in favor of such candidates as will be found to favor their cause; 3, to enter into relation with all existing organizations of women—of which so many have sprung up just without the gates of the franchise,—to study their work and summarize its results,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and at every available opportunity to urge the suffrage idea as the necessary and logical correlative of such work; 4, to continue the special work of collecting signatures to the suffrage petitions, which have already enrolled a number equal to more than a third of the voting population of the State, but which are destined to grow still further by incessantly new accretion. These committees, in all the Assembly districts of city or county, would report to the central organization of New York City, with which a vigorous correspondence would be maintained. The organization, co-operating with the elder suffrage leagues, will prepare to focus its action upon the State Legislature, which will be henceforth addressed annually on the enfranchisement of women, exactly as has been done for many years in Massachusetts, where, as every one knows, who chooses to remember, the suffrage was lost to women last year by only ten votes.

To the steadily expanding powers of women, citizenship can be denied only on the ground that its duties constitute a special sphere, walled off from the life, the thoughts, the daily concerns of the people of the State, that is, of citizens; or else that women, though involved in every transaction which takes place, in every interest which is to be defended, in every principle which is at stake, in every movement which goes on, are nevertheless absolutely uninterested, unconcerned, incompetent, the very highest among them below the level of the lowest who now enjoy citizenship. Either supposition is absurd, and cannot therefore indefinitely maintain itself against the reason of reasonable men. Some moment will arrive, some little interregnum of comparative party peace, when the Republicans will no longer be fearing to lose their grip on the State, nor the Democrats be fighting for existence; and when live interests will have shouldered their way to the front at the expense of those which shall have grown obsolete. Without other theoretical reason than exists now, but only in virtue of the expansion of new vitalities, resistance, mined to a shell, will suddenly collapse; and the "gigantic revolution" will be effected as noiselessly as the fall of winter snow-flakes.

MARY PUTNAM JACOBI.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CHIEF INFLUENCES ON MY CAREER.[1]

THE most powerful influences over my life have been: 1. Literature; 2. Nature in Landscape; 3. The Graphic Arts; 4. Society. It may seem strange that I should put human intercourse last, but the reason is that I have lived very much in the country, both in England and France, and especially in Scotland, where books and landscapes were more easily accessible than cultivated people. Society, for me, has been chiefly in London, and, in a minor degree, in Paris. My debt to books is infinite and my love of reading seems to increase with age. As for natural landscape, it has always been to me an unfailing pleasure, an inexhaustible study, and a source of refreshment and consolation. The Graphic Arts interested me first because they could represent landscape more or less faithfully; not till later did I understand them as an expression of human sentiment and creative genius.

I was brought up in a part of Lancashire where the contrast between beauty and ugliness was, in those days, extremely strong. The valleys, for the most part, were occupied by manufacturing towns in which there was no visible trace of beauty or of art, but the neighborhood of Burnley, where I lived, was rich in natural beauty, still unspoiled. There were the little rocky dells where the streams slept in clear pools or plunged in miniature cascades, there were ancient crags and cliffs, undulating green pastures, a noble old park with stately avenues, and when I wanted a wider expanse I had only to go out upon the moorland for a view of the Yorkshire hills with a glimpse of the Irish Sea. I lived at that time in an old "house of seven gables" that belonged to one of my uncles. The fields that surrounded it were all meadow or pasture and they were bounded by a rocky stream. A little further up the same stream was an ancient hamlet with a gray old house where Spenser, the poet, was believed to have lived during his sojourn in the north of England. It is not absolutely certain that he lived there, but the amount of evidence (I have not space for it here) is sufficient to establish a

[1] This paper has a melancholy interest because it is among the last products of Mr. Hamerton's pen, if not the last. He died in London on November 5.—Editor FORUM.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

probability and so to give a poetic interest to the place. As to more modern celebrities, Turner had worked a few miles away and "Jane Eyre" was written by a young lady who was almost a neighbor of ours and who knew one of our friends. The Lake District was so near that I once rode to visit it on horseback, and the scenery of Craven, within a day's drive, had many literary and artistic, as well as historical, associations.

But however beautiful a country may be it teaches nothing by itself, not even botany or landscape-painting. Access to a city of some importance is absolutely necessary to the development either of a writer or an artist. I had this in Manchester. It was possible to go there by an early train, spend several hours, and return home in the evening. This kept me "in touch" with modern painting which was at least sufficiently represented there by the local and the dealers' exhibitions. Our northern manufacturing district with its numerous towns so close to each other and so intimately connected by railways is, in fact, like one enormous city, comparable to London, and as the race that created it is very industrious, enterprising, and intelligent, that region is far more favorable to mental development than the purely agricultural districts. As for London, I first became acquainted with it in the year 1851, but not intimately, as my relations had only distant acquaintances in the London society of those days, elderly people who seemed like icebergs to my boyish imagination. I took a dislike to the long and dismal streets with their rows of oblong openings in the dirty brick for windows. London has been greatly improved since those days and has now become, at least in some parts, a comparatively picturesque and interesting city.

As for the personal influences that acted upon me in childhood and youth, I never knew my mother who died very early and I lost my father in my tenth year. He taught me two things: to ride, and to read English aloud in a distinct manner. My appointed teachers, according to English custom, were a succession of clergymen. I read English easily at the age of four and began Latin at five-and-a-half but Greek was deferred till I was eleven. After my father's death, his eldest sister was my guardian and she very kindly grounded me in French. I remember afterwards that when I was at school at Doncaster I wanted to give up French, but she insisted on my going on with it, thereby, without knowing it, setting in motion a train of causes that ended with my residence in France. She exercised a very strong influence on my life in various ways, espe-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cially through the warmth of the affection I had for her and which is still to me like a religion. In those days the convenient words "Philistine" and "Philistinism" had not been invented, or at least not introduced into the English language, but I never knew any one who disliked what we now call Philistinism more. Some years later she said to me, "I know you will be an author and that is a good reason for diligence in your studies, as an ignorant author is a poor creature." She was always anxious that I should take good honors at Oxford, but when the time came for going there I found myself unable to sign the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England. The University "tests," so rigorously maintained in those days, were a sort of network ingeniously contrived for the admission of liars and hypocrites and the exclusion of all who were at the same time honest and more or less estranged from the Church of England. And so I missed the advantages that Oxford might have given and (a consideration of far more importance in my eyes) lost the chance of fulfilling what at that time was my guardian's most cherished hope and ambition with regard to me. My classical education had been carried on at two schools, Burnley and Doncaster, and under two private tutors, Dr. Butler and Mr. Hinde. Dr. Butler was a gentleman and a scholar, but he had a great affection for me and was too indulgent. Mr. Hinde, who had married one of my aunts, had been a tutor at Oxford (I mean what is called "a coach"). He was a man of remarkable classical attainments, and he exhibited an undisguised contempt for every one (including myself) who could not read Greek quite so easily as he did. However, he was an efficient teacher if not an agreeable one, and he would have made a Hellenist of me if I had stayed with him long enough. Unfortunately his influence over me was exactly the contrary of that which my guardian anticipated, for he let me perceive that a classical scholar could be a narrow and unjust critic of the English literature that I loved, so that I failed to see the advantages of classical scholarship in the general enlightenment of the mind. In another way, too, his influence was against my guardian's hopes for me, as his extreme intolerance of Dissenters and especially his firm belief in the future damnation of all Unitarians, made me, by a natural reaction, tolerant of heresy in all its forms, provided only that it was conscientious and sincere and free from a narrow spirit of sectarianism.

This repellent effect of what otherwise might have been encouraging examples produced in me a dislike to the exclusive pursuit of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wealth, as I had a friend (a distant relation), who was making a large fortune in business and so devoted to this object that he could hardly find a minute for anything else. His own wants were remarkably moderate, and his expenditure less than the interest of a sum equivalent to his income for one year. His habits appeared to me absolutely irrational, as he was accumulating money that he did not want and for which he had no use, while at the same time he was allowing the best years of life to slip by without seizing upon its innumerable opportunities. He had no time for anything, no time for travel, for reading, or for society. He gave as a reason for not getting married that he had "never found time to do the courting." This led me to a philosophy about money which differed essentially from his, and for some years I did not attach sufficient importance to it. One may value wealth for its good uses and dislike poverty, not because it has no luxuries, but because it is without leisure, privacy, or peace.

When I was about eighteen years old I determined to be a landscape-painter. I had always been in the habit of drawing and had learned almost from childhood what drawing-masters used to teach in those days. It did not amount to very much, but it helped to foster the intensely strong instinct of affection that I had for the scenery of the north of England and still more for the sublimer scenery of Scotland. This brought me under new influences, as it led me to make the acquaintance of some artists in London and elsewhere, while, for the time, I completely abandoned my classical studies just when they might have been most profitable and most effectual. However, the pursuit of painting gave me access to other ideas which were a great refreshment to my mind and increased my interest in nature. Besides this, it enlarged my acquaintance with mankind. Young gentlemen in England were then exclusively under the direction of clergymen. I had been so myself from the age of five to that of eighteen. In the provincial upper class at that time, artists were personally quite unknown, and were supposed to be idle and disreputable.

Two of the artists I first became acquainted with were Mr. Pettitt, a landscape-painter, and Mr. Leslie, the Royal Academician. Pettitt was a man of immense energy and industry, who kept a very large family by incessant labor: altogether an entirely respectable and manly character with a powerful, though uneducated, mind. His reputation as an artist was never brilliant, and it has not lasted, but he could earn a fair income by his strenuous toil and he spent nothing on himself. I first met with him in the Lake District, at Kes-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wick, and he taught me more in about a week than I had learned from all previous teachers. After that, I worked in his studio in London. His way was to begin a picture, advance it a little, and then make me copy it twice on canvases of its own size. By this practice I very soon became intimately acquainted with his processes and could mimic his workmanship like a forger, so that he did not readily distinguish my copies from his originals. One day I put the copy on his easel, and he went on innocently working in the belief that it was his own picture until I told him. Still, his influence over me was not entirely beneficial. He had a passionate love of nature, but I had that myself already and did not require to have it intensified. What I needed was some idea of the distinction between art as art, and the confused and intricate nature which supplies the raw material of art. This, Pettitt could not communicate to me, because his own conception of the duty of an artist was simply to copy nature just as it was and as accurately as the most unflinching out-door study might enable him to do it.

Mr. Leslie might have taught me far more about art, but as he was a figure-painter and I wanted to learn landscape, not having at that time any notion of extending my studies into art-criticism, I did not profit by Mr. Leslie's knowledge and experience nearly so much as I might have done. However, I owe him a debt of lasting gratitude for having taught me to appreciate, at least in some degree, the etchings of Rembrandt; and though I could not fully appreciate Constable in those days, still Mr. Leslie made me very intimately acquainted with his work, and so laid the foundation of an understanding of it that came to me afterward. Besides this, Mr. Leslie was a man of culture, at least in English, which he spoke and wrote not only correctly but with a certain taste and elegance that he had derived from the masters of the eighteenth century. His influence over me was in all ways a civilizing influence.

Luckily for me, I had another friend who kept me more in touch with my earlier education. This was Robert William Mackay, author of "The Progress of the Intellect as Exemplified in the Religious Development of the Greeks and Hebrews." As Mr. Mackay had a substantial private fortune, he could devote himself entirely to his studies with complete indifference to the sale of his books, which were published at his own expense and at a loss to himself, while even if their sale had been much larger the infinite labor he bestowed upon them must have made such writing as his an entirely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unprofitable occupation. But, though Mr. Mackay did not work for money, his authorship was far, indeed, from being the amusement of a literary amateur. His object was to create in the public mind a better understanding of the history of religions by following them in their growth, and he hoped that this better understanding might lead to a wider toleration than that which existed in the still bigoted England of his time. Unfortunately for the success of his attempt his style of writing, though most sound and scholarly, was too learned and not sufficiently entertaining for the general public, and so his influence was confined to a small circle of readers, which, however, included some of the best intellects in England, the historian Buckle being amongst them. No doubt Mr. Mackay may be credited with some share in the great improvement we have since witnessed in the liberality of English opinion, but whatever good he has done has been effected indirectly, as the general public is naturally ignorant of his writings, and even of his name. My only regret is that Mr. Mackay's influence over me was not still stronger. He was one of the most cultivated men in England, and it would have been easy for me, under his direction, to go on with my intellectual culture without suspending it, as I did at that time, in order to devote myself exclusively to painting. However, it was something for me to be in constant intercourse with a superior intellect like his.

At Mr. Mackay's house I often met Mr. Watkiss Lloyd, a man of very high culture indeed and a thorough gentleman, who had the good sense to secure a competency in commerce before devoting himself wholly to intellectual pursuits. Mr. Lloyd was a noble specimen of our English race, both physically and mentally. He lived to be eighty, and at seventy-six looked certainly twenty years younger. His favorite study was Greek literature, and he wrote a history of Greece which was never published, besides other works, of which only a few have seen the light. He had the gifts of a scholar, and if he had only possessed the art of writing, which has often belonged to his inferiors, he would have become celebrated, but his style was difficult to read, being wanting in simplicity and lucidity. He talked well, and was a charming companion, with his kindness and humor and amply abundant information. Mackay had very poor conversational powers, though what he said was always worth waiting for.

I went to Paris in 1855 to study painting and improve my French. There I met, among other people, my future father-in-law, who, though not practically an artist, even as an amateur, had a far better

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

knowledge of the artistic element in painting than I had myself in those days, and he might have effected in me the necessary evolution if I had been rather better prepared for it. I observed French art with some curiosity, but it had no influence upon me, and whatever advantage I got from Paris was on the literary side. During this first visit to Paris, I became acquainted with Mr. Wyld, the painter, who had a very favorable influence upon me much later, but not at that time. He was essentially an artist and I a naturalist, so that his work inevitably seemed to me too artificial. But the advantage that I got on the literary side was very great, as I had suspended my studies in Latin and Greek and needed the discipline of another classical foreign tongue with a difficult grammar.[1] By good luck I felt attracted to French, which afterwards brought me back to literary studies in other languages.

It is a wonder to me now that I could leave my books in Lancashire and go to paint from nature in the Highlands of Scotland with only half-a-dozen volumes in my hut. I was trying very hard to become a photographic landscape-painter: that is, a landscape-painter who makes perfectly accurate portraits of the scenes which he professes to represent. It was an interesting pursuit for two reasons: first, because there had been so little truthful landscape-painting in previous art, so that the aim had the attraction of novelty; and again, because I loved my favorite scenes so intensely that no degree of fidelity could be too perfect for my affection. I was confirmed in these tendencies by Mr. Ruskin, who at that time believed that there was room for a new school of truthful landscape-painting, and his own drawings from nature belonged to it. Some critics have represented me as his pupil or follower, but on a comparison of dates I find that I had done some careful topographic work before the publication of the fourth volume of "Modern Painters," in which he explained and advocated it. It is scarcely necessary to add that topographic landscape-painting can have nothing of the charm or seductiveness of the pleasure-giving fine arts, which are emotional, and that, human nature being what it is, a topographic picture can no more affect people's feelings than a map. From the purely artistic point of view I had, therefore, gone astray; I had not been led astray by Mr. Ruskin, but I had been confirmed by him in my error. We may both of us be excused on the ground that all accurate draughtsmanship, if it is applied to land-

[1] If any critic says that French is easy I ask him if he can write it quite correctly.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scape, must lead to topography as inevitably as accuracy in writing leads to prose. An artistic landscape is a sort of visible music, admitting refinement but not accuracy of form, and requiring for its full effect upon the mind the harmonies of color and light and shade which present difficulties analogous to those of musical composition.

Marriage has always a great influence upon culture. It very frequently puts a stop to it altogether. As my wife was a Parisian with a strong taste for the classical literature of her own country, I became her pupil in French and she became mine in English. We made it a rule in our private conversation never to allow a fault in either language to pass uncorrected, and we read aloud to each other a great deal. At one time my wife read to me three or four hours a day. As we chose our books very carefully, this practice was almost an education in itself. We afterwards passed on to Italian together, with the help of a master. I then found, as Franklin had done before me, that the study of French and Italian had increased, in a conveniently unconscious way, my knowledge of Latin, and Latin led me back to Greek. This is mentioned without the slightest pretension to scholarship. In the use of languages I have one faculty which seems to be rather uncommon, that of keeping them entirely separated. When speaking or writing French, I am, for the time being, like one totally ignorant of English, as English words do not occur to me, and I never translate anything, not even weights and measures, or money, or the thermometer, from one language to the other, but think in each, independently. My marriage has certainly been most favorable to the continuance of my education in literature and even in the fine arts, as my wife has always been on the side of genuine art against the servile, literal, and unintelligent copyism of natural objects.

I have long had a taste for philology, and during the last five years this has been favored by my friend and son-in-law, Professor Raillard, who is a philologist of much learning and ability, with a happy instinct for original investigation and discovery. We have done a good deal of work together, and hope to do more.

It has been a great advantage to me to work in concert with Mr. Richmond Seeley, the publisher, in the management of the "Portfolio." His knowledge of business, of the fine arts, and of human nature has always been instantly at my service, and I have often been credited with merits that were the result of his suggestions.

During my residence near Autun my most intimate friend was Mr.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Stanislas Schmitt, at that time principal of the college there. He talked with me on all sorts of subjects in French of the most classical purity, as he hated the carelessness and vulgarity of the present day which are ruining the beautiful French language.

I have lived so much away from England that my personal intercourse with English writers of eminence has been very occasional, though in some cases it was supplemented by correspondence. Perhaps it would be claiming too much to say that Robert Browning, Matthew Arnold, George Eliot and R. L. Stevenson were friends of mine, but they behaved to me as if they had been both friends and neighbors.

When a man lives much in the country he is likely, if he reads, to be chiefly influenced by books. In this way I have been strongly influenced by John Mill, whom I once met, but did not know personally. Mill had a power over all my thinking.

I became acquainted with Comte's "Positive Philosophy" in 1853. He has influenced me chiefly by his luminous statement of two laws. The first is his well-known law that each of our leading conceptions, each branch of our knowledge, passes through three different theoretical conditions, the theological, the metaphysical, and the positive. The second concerns fine art, and divides it into three essential elements: 1. Observation with Imitation. 2. Idealization. 3. Expression. These two laws still seem to me unassailable, and I value Comte's statement of them as a precious help in scientific thinking and in art-criticism. The second may even be a guide in the practice of the fine arts. But I never accepted Comte's religion, as, without being a misanthropist, I do not admire the human race sufficiently to worship it.

Mr. Ruskin intensified the love of nature, and at one time stimulated me in the study of the fine arts. In art, however, we have long differed in opinion in a way that can be easily explained. Mr. Ruskin has remained, at least in theory, faithful to the doctrine of Leonardo da Vinci that the best picture is the picture which most closely resembles the reflection of nature in a mirror. My doctrine is that the art of the painter expresses his peculiar feeling and his special qualities as an observer, not by a generally indiscriminate fidelity, but by selection and emphasis, very frequently even by simple omission; and I say that a picture like a reflection in a mirror, without either selection or composition, would not have the qualities of fine art, but would be something like photography with the addition of color. Again, with regard to etching, it is an art which Mr. Ruskin has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unsparingly condemned, whereas I have encouraged the study and practice of it in a volume which has been frequently reprinted, and also by the publication of etchings in the "Portfolio." Assuredly, as to this art, Sir Seymour Haden exercised a far stronger influence over me than Mr. Ruskin. As to the most important matters of all, Mr. Ruskin's intellect is, or used to be, intensely theological, but the longer I live the more evident it seems to me that we are all under the immediate dominion of natural forces that act unconsciously as the wind does when it either helps a vessel on its voyage and pleases the sailors or wrecks it on a rocky shore and drowns them, the natural power being equally indifferent in both cases, though in one it does good to men and in the other evil. I speak here of the action of natural law which we have innumerable opportunities for observing, and not of its origin, which we were born too late to see.

On the subject of natural law, especially in its relation to ethics, I owe more to Professor Huxley than to any one else. He has been the first to state with perfect clearness the true relation of man to nature, and though his statement of the case is neither devotional nor enthusiastic it disengages us from what is untenable in natural religion and sets human ethics on a higher plane. I value especially his Romanes Lecture of 1893, in which he plainly says that "cosmic nature is no school of virtue but the headquarters of the enemy of ethical nature," and that "so far forth as we possess a power of bettering things it is our paramount duty to use it."

Professor Huxley brings me to Mr. Frederic Harrison, whom he treated very unfairly. I occasionally met Mr. Harrison in former years, and we have renewed our acquaintance since. I wish I had known him from boyhood; the example of his energetic industry and ever active intelligence, with his cool superiority to misrepresentation, would have been valuable to me in many ways. He is a rare example of a man of the highest culture who is not in the least encumbered by his culture; another example is Mr. Gladstone. I have known scholars (Mackay was an instance) whose learning burdened them like a panoply of lead. Another great and rare quality in Mr. Harrison is the power of taking an equally keen interest in the past and the present. It is unfortunate for him that his advocacy of Positivism has put a weapon into the hands of his enemies who can so easily, though disingenuously, accuse him (a perfectly sane man) of sharing all the mental aberrations of Auguste Comte.

P. G. HAMERTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MAY A MAN CONDUCT HIS BUSINESS AS HE PLEASE?

A GREAT many valuable lessons will be learned from the Chicago strike of last summer; many suggestions for relief will grow out of it; and many questions, both ethical and economic, will be emphasized by the experiences and the conditions attending it. While studying its phases, its origin, its course, and its close, two very far-reaching ethical-economic questions have been constantly in my mind. They can be answered to a certain extent—in fact, they have partially been answered. They are not wholly new questions, but in the near future, they will be urged by both labor and capital with intense interest in the answer to be given by society, for they strike at the fundamental principles of business-law and at the moral effects of conducting business rigidly in accordance with such law. They are:

1. Shall a man conduct his own business in his own way?

2. Shall the savings of labor be considered a reserve, from which labor must draw, in order to enable it to subsist during periods of depression or of adversity, while the reserve of capital is kept practically intact under like circumstances, or, if drawn upon at all, in less measure than labor draws on its savings?

The first question was asked many centuries ago when a great employer of labor was trying to satisfy the workers in his vineyard that the man who worked one hour during the day should be paid as much as the man who worked all day. The question then was put in the following form: "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?" A small strike was imminent on account of the payment of a full day's wage to those who had come into the vineyard at the eleventh hour. There seems then to have been no logical answer to the inquiry. The reasoning of the employer in asking this question was purely ethical, and the question itself apparently satisfied the turbulent workmen.

The great employer of to-day, when asked to make some concessions to labor or to arbitrate differences which have arisen between him and his employees, declares that in order to win success he must have complete control of his own affairs; and he asks, "Shall I not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conduct my own business in my own way?" Under some circumstances the employee asks, "Have you the right to conduct your own business in your own way?" Society has long since answered these questions in some important particulars. It says to the property-owner, the manufacturer: "You must not so conduct your business as to injure the property of your neighbor, nor must you conduct your business in such way as to injure the health of your neighbor. No property-owner can do anything that will interfere with the rights and privileges of his neighbor, whether these rights and privileges come under the head of right to freedom from injury to property, or the privilege of living without damage to health." These principles are so old, and so well defined by precedent and by statute, that the answer is complete and emphatic in so far as the two features named are concerned; and no question is made as to the soundness, either in ethics or in economics, of the position which society has taken in the premises. A man cannot divert a stream, if by such diversion he overflows the lands of his neighbor, without being compelled to answer in damages for his act; nor can he erect a manufactory whose processes injure the health of the community. Law furnishes ample remedy in either of these cases. In fact, the property-owner has no clear, absolute title in himself to the property which he has bought and paid for in full. Society can take it, under certain restrictions and rules, by giving the owner, not the compensation which he asks, but the compensation which society, through its organized forces, considers sufficient. All the labor which the property-owner has expended and which is unseen goes for naught. The improvements which he has erected, but which are not represented by tangible entities, also go for naught. He must contribute something, when his land is taken under the right of eminent domain, to the welfare of society and accept the award of damages by the properly constituted authority. He, therefore, cannot administer his own affairs in his own way in so far as the foregoing rules apply.

But the question which is much more far-reaching, and which will inevitably be answered by society, relates to conditions of men rather than to their material surroundings; and this question is: "Shall a man or a corporation who does not, or is not able to, conduct his or its affairs so as to avoid public disturbance, obstruction of trade, loss of wages, or the lowering of the standard of living, be free from the interference of society?" Will not communities say to the employer: "If you cannot so conduct your business, or manufactory, or railroad

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that public business be not disturbed or the standard of life interfered with, we shall take some part in the management, or insist upon some adjustment by which society shall be free from disturbance"? The broad answer will come in due time,—in fact, it has come,—not by revolutionary methods, but by the processes of reason, the application of justice, and the rule of right.

All attempts at conciliation and arbitration, whether they work under the form of law through boards established by the State or by the mutual consent of the parties involved in an industrial dispute, emphatically declare that society has the right to interfere. When two parties to an industrial controversy by mutual consent agree to leave the matters in dispute to arbitrators, even those selected by themselves, they virtually agree that others may decide methods of business; and when the State has erected a Board of Arbitration instructed by law first to undertake conciliatory measures and, failing therein, to proffer its services as a Board of Arbitration, it has emphatically announced that it will interfere when the employer does not or is not able to conduct his affairs in such way as to avoid disturbance. This action is based on the ethical position that the Government is bound to protect society and to secure to it peace and tranquillity. The stoppage of traffic, the hindrance of business, the general disruption of peaceful relations, the violence and crime, which come logically in the train of an industrial dispute, are menaces to the welfare of society; and the State is in duty bound to do all in its power to prevent their recurrence. And, since the power which the State has comes from the people, it is bound to exercise that power for the good of all, even if the individual suffers as a consequence.

The constitutionality of such acts cannot now be discussed, or, if discussed, denied. The statute-books of the States and of the Nation and the decisions of the courts everywhere have established too many precedents to enable us to avoid the logical conclusion. The enactments of the Interstate-Commerce Law, by which the Federal Government under certain circumstances undertakes to regulate freight-rates, is a clearly defined instance of the necessity of Government interference to prevent the disturbance of trade. If it can interfere to prevent the disturbance of trade, can it not interfere to prevent the disturbance of society? Cannot the State say to both labor and capital, "You must so conduct your affairs as to leave people at peace"?

It must be admitted at once that, in so far as the individual is concerned, the extension of this answer to the scope which it will

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

take in the future is uneconomic. It is not good political economy, perhaps, but is it not good ethics? The employer or the employee may firmly believe that there is nothing in his conduct which warrants the interference of the public; but, if the public is subjected to great loss, to great inconvenience, to paralysis of trade, should not the individual who precipitates the difficulty be held responsible and accountable to the power which enables him to conduct his business or to perform his labor at all? And especially, when organized capital asks of the State peculiar privileges, under special acts or charters, and at the same time asks that individuals contributing capital be relieved from responsibility of the person, does not the question which has been suggested come with still greater force? And is not the answer that the State shall interfere made with greater emphasis?

The second question,—"Shall the undivided surplus profits of labor be drawn upon to sustain it in times of adversity, while the undivided surplus profits of capital remain practically intact?"—is not only an economic one but an ethical one, and is closely related to the first question. The laws of business and the true principles of political economy insist that profits once made shall remain intact. Of course large business houses, manufactories, and corporations engaged in production, if they are wise, look out for their reserves as well as for their dividends, and these reserves are used to offset deterioration of plant and to provide for the purchase of new machinery as invention demands it or as competition makes it necessary. An experienced and successful manager of one of the largest works in the country once told me that he had more difficulty in convincing his directors of the danger of declaring a dividend which should absorb all the profits, than he had in convincing his men that the conditions of production warranted a decrease in wages. I imagine this is quite generally true, because the stockholder, who is represented more intimately by the director, feels that all the profits of the concern should be divided; but the manager, who is responsible for the successful prosecution of the business, knows well that he must not only pay dividends, but must prevent too great a deterioration of his works.

Labor is paid its part of the profits through wages; and, if the individual laborers are prudent, self-denying, and imbued with frugal habits, they save money, which goes into the savings-banks. Probably in those States where savings-banks have been established, about 50 per cent of the deposits belong to the working-people. This has been demonstrated by investigation. These deposits represent the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

undivided profits of labor, its surplus in carrying on the productive industry. They constitute labor's reserve, carefully husbanded and wisely increased, for the purpose of meeting contingencies as they may arise,—not the renewal of plant, but to offset the deterioration which comes of exacting labor and of increasing responsibilities, and to make provision against sickness and old age. These reserves are as essential to the integrity of the business of a community as are the reserves of capital to prevent deterioration and waste of plant and for the introduction of new processes as they become necessary. Here, then, we have two reserves,—1. The undivided profits of business held by capital for legitimate purposes, and absolutely essential to the integrity of production; 2. The undivided profits of labor, which are as essential to the success of business as the profits of capital.

The trouble comes when, through depression, through competition, or other circumstances, wages are reduced; and, in so much as they are reduced, the possibility of keeping labor's reserve intact is lessened. If the necessity extend or continue, the possibility of keeping its reserve intact is not only lessened, but completely destroyed; and, in order to keep in condition to earn even enough wages to come up to the life-line, the reserves are drawn upon and in many cases entirely exhausted, in order that the processes of production may go on. Capital in the mean time rarely draws upon its reserve to sustain its productive processes, while it may and often does reduce the usual dividends; and sometimes its dividends may be wiped out completely, just as the surplus earnings of labor may be wiped out completely. But recently we have seen that labor has not only been obliged, under the depressed condition of business, to accept most serious reductions in wages, but to draw heavily on its reserve; while capital not only preserved its reserve intact, but did not suffer materially in its dividends, although it did meet current losses in its production. I am not speaking, of course, of losses on account of strikes.

This state of affairs is leading to the second question stated above, whether labor's reserves shall be exhausted in order to enable it to work, while the reserves of capital are kept practically intact. I do not know the answer to this question. The ethical view of it is clear; and even the economic view, which would insist that there shall be no answer, is quite as clear when economics only are considered; but the question indicates one of the chief causes of unrest that prevail in the ranks of labor. There is, at least, a suggestion of injustice, of unequal losses, and of over-drafts upon the side of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labor. The injustice comes because labor is just as essential to production as capital, and neither can succeed without the full supplemental work of the other. It is idle for capital to say to labor, "If you do not wish to work for the terms I offer, you can go elsewhere." It is not only idle, but unjust and brutal. It is idle for labor to say to capital, "If you do not do so-and-so, we will not work." This, too, is not only idle, but it is brutal. The only result is the destruction of each by the other and the death of industry. In the question there is a deep, underlying ethical and economic significance; and the welfare of society, sustained peaceful relations of capital and labor, the prosperous conduct of productive industry,—are all involved in the adjustment, on an ethical and economic basis, of one of the most trying and at the same time urgent problems of the day. Industry cannot succeed, labor cannot prosper, progress cannot be continued, unless all the vital forces of production can be preserved in their integrity. The impairment of capital is the loss of labor: the impairment of labor is the loss of capital. These relations are reciprocal, but they are not identical. Will the wisdom of the day, will the re-writing of political economy, will the inculcation of higher and deeper ethical lessons, settle it? I believe so, most emphatically; but how and under what conditions this disturbing question will be answered is more than human wisdom just now can suggest. It may be that corporations and concerns engaged in productive industry will say to labor, "We will, with your assistance, establish a wage reserve-fund, by setting aside an equitable share of profits and an equitable share of wages, to be used in times of depression or of disaster for the purpose of keeping in healthful working condition the labor of the establishment, for preventing its dissipation, for avoiding the unequal draft upon labor's reserve, and even for conducting the works temporarily at a loss."

Some attempt has been made to answer this question through the methods known as industrial partnership, profit-sharing, co-operation, and other kindred means. While they are all good under some conditions, they have never been advocated as complete solutions of the difficulty; but the advocates of these palliative methods have clearly understood the ethics of the inquiry.

Labor would not contend so savagely against a reduction of wages under bad economic conditions if it felt morally certain that with restored conditions its share of the profits, which it receives in the form of wages, would be restored; for in the majority of cases it knows

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perfectly well that wages cannot be restored except by the most serious effort and contention. It, therefore, makes a strenuous fight against reductions, not so much on account of the reductions themselves, as on account of the certain knowledge that in order to restore what is reduced it must make another and a bitterer contest. Those concerns that increase wages voluntarily, when the conditions of production warrant, have little or no trouble.

These two questions which I have outlined, and which must receive the candid consideration of all men who care more for the welfare of society than for any individual member of it, indicate some of the underlying motives or reasons for labor controversies. Should they be settled on broad and logical grounds, the man who then so misconducts his business as to permit a strike to occur in his works will meet not only disgrace, like the fraudulent bankrupt, but the severe condemnation of the society from which he derives all his prosperity; and, with labor, he will be taught the lesson that that society which gives prosperity to them both will undertake to protect itself against individual encroachments upon its peace; for it is society that gives value to the production of labor. Without society there is no value: without industry there is no society. Labor makes things: society, competitive desire, gives them value. "Historical facts and evolutionary principles coincide with the proposition that the laborer is the member of society in and through whom that society survives; . . . and the wages of workers are to society what food is to the body—they enrich, strengthen, and make healthy the life-blood of the social organism."[1] The heart might as well claim that its functions alone are essential to the continuance of life, as against the claim of the stomach, as for either labor or capital to claim that its offices alone are essential to industrial prosperity and social progress. So society will answer these two far-reaching questions, in the interest of all and not of the individual. The answer will not come through revolutionary changes, but by a recognition of the ever-increasing intelligence of the men involved in industry.

At present the industrial world is disturbed by a succession of labor controversies, but these controversies must not be assigned to a supposed increasing antagonism, to retrogression, or to any anarchistic desire to destroy the grand results of past developments. On the other hand, it should be recognized that the man who works for wages has been taught to realize the conditions of a higher civilization, to

[1] James A. Skilton, Esq., in discussing "The Race Problem in the South."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appreciate, to understand, and to desire still greater mental, moral, and social progress; he has been taught, and by modern ingenuity enabled, to enjoy art, music, and literature; he understands that he is one of the sovereigns of the land, that he is a political and moral factor; and he now begins to comprehend that the labor question means simply the struggle for a higher standard of living. But, with all this, he finds that he still keeps the position of a wage-receiver in enterprises in which his skill as well as his hand is a necessity. The honest and the intelligent workman, so far as he is engaged in the controversies of the day, is practically the conservator of all the required forces of industry; but this man seeks in this conservation to become more closely allied to the factor of capital, which without him he knows to be dead material. He now comprehends, more clearly than he has comprehended at any other period, that he has outgrown the purely physiological relations which labor bears to production,—that is, the position of the animal; and he knows that he supplies the developed mental qualities of the man. Seeing this, he sees that he vitalizes the material side of production, which is capital. He, therefore, asks that he may become more closely associated with capital in productive enterprises, and desires also to secure a more liberal, and what most men would consider a more nearly just, share of the benefits arising from modern inventions than now falls to him.

The great problem of this age is how a new system shall be established, with perfect justice to capital and to labor, recognizing the moral forces at work contemporaneously with the industrial forces. I feel so sure that this problem will be solved on the broadest business basis, through the practical application of moral principles with economic laws, that I have little anxiety for the industrial future of the country. I know that no one element can come in as a panacea for ills, but I am morally certain that a combination of elements can be so applied, and will be so applied, as to relieve industry of the present apparent warfare and to answer practically the queries that have been propounded in this article. We are often confused in attempts to consider such questions, because progress has been so rapid that we fail to see the intelligence underlying industrial controversies. Ignorance, selfishness, perhaps dishonesty are all interwoven with intelligence, often so closely that it seems as if the unhappy conditions made intelligence subordinate; but the development will go on, and we shall see the results of society's answer in a better and greater and more equal diffusion of wealth. CARROLL D. WRIGHT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STOCK-SHARING AS A PREVENTIVE OF LABOR TROUBLES.

It is not difficult to find men of intelligence above the average who maintain that there is no "labor question"; that, with the exception of a few refractory agitators, the laboring classes are perfectly satisfied; or that, if they are not satisfied, they ought to be. That the average wage-earner lives in greater comfort, is better housed, better clothed, and better fed than the richest nobleman of six hundred years ago, is undeniably true. It is true also that while in this century capital has had to content itself with a steadily shrinking interest-rate, the return for labor, viewed both in the light of increased wages and of shortened hours, has steadily risen. Let it be noted, too, that wages have risen despite the fact that the prices of commodities have greatly fallen. Yet a deep-seated, turbulent feeling of dissatisfaction prevails among the laboring classes; and there must be some defect of mental vision in the man who does not clearly see that dissatisfaction does exist and that it is rapidly growing.

Whence comes it? How explain this strange coupling of increasing physical comfort with increasing discontent? Many replies suggest themselves. The widespread ability to read, resulting in the wonderful multiplication of newspapers and books, and the rise of labor organizations in which large numbers of men can be readily appealed to, have given the agitator and the theorist a new opportunity.

We all recognize that fortunes have been piled up in this century as never before; that luxury and vain extravagance parade themselves with flaunting insolence; that an irritating class of the idle rich is being created; that the obligations of wealth are largely disregarded; and that the miserable standard which has been set up between man and man is that very wealth which is so unequally distributed. Taking these facts as a background, one set of theorists say to the labor classes: "All men are born equal. The French philosophers of the last century said so. Our Declaration of Independence says so. That all men are born equal as to rights and obligations no one disputes. Our universal suffrage proves that. You may never have saved a penny, and you may be generally ignorant, yet your vote counts just

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as much as Mr. Vanderbilt's or as President Eliot's. But you are born equal also in all other respects; and, if you find any inequality, it is because somebody has stolen your equal share. This stealing will continue so long as individuals control capital and production. Make the state the only capitalist and the only producer, and then we may divide up the proceeds equally and we shall all be equally rich." —"Or equally poor," answers the critic.

Other theorists preach: "Money is wealth. The government-stamp makes money. Its stamp on fifty cents worth of silver makes it worth one hundred cents. Its stamp on a bit of paper makes it worth a dollar. We cannot have too much money. Those bad men in Wall Street and those greedy bankers throughout the country wish to contract the money-supply. That will make interest high. That will force wages down. Let us have all the money we want. That will bring good times. That will make wages go up."—"And make bread and meat and every other commodity go proportionately much higher," says the critic.

Another school plausibly urges: "Land is the basis of all food-supply and of all wealth. The benefits of all inventions and of all material human progress have gone principally into the pockets of the owners of the soil. The landowner robs both the capitalist and the laborer. It is growth in population which makes the increase in the value of the land. The state, therefore, which represents the population, is entitled to the increase. Individual ownership of land must cease. The good faith of centuries must count for nothing. The first owner of possibly a thousand years ago had no good title. The state recognized that title under a mistake. Now, although innocent holders, justified by the state's recognition, have again and again exchanged the fruits of their industry for that land, yet, to produce general prosperity, the state must confiscate it. No, it will not confiscate the land," explains this theorist, "but it will confiscate the land-value."—"A distinction without any practical difference," exclaims the critic.

The advocacy of all of these and related theories have had their undoubted effect in stimulating discontent among the classes who work for wages. But there is another cause which lies deeper and which, however unrecognized, is yet the main reason for the present restless dissatisfaction and angry clash between the employing and the employed classes.

The personal tie which bound man to man under feudalism was,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in a large degree, kept alive under the industrial system which followed and which prevailed far into this century. So long as business and manufacture were conducted on a small scale, every employer stood in a close, personal relation to the man who did his work. Such a relationship, as compared with the independence of the present time, may have begotten too much dependence on the one side and too much protection on the other, but the tie was something more than could be expressed by a mere wage-equivalent. The workman knew his employer well, saw him frequently, worked at his side, could understand what had given him a higher position; yet he did not feel that a great social chasm yawned between them. That tie was human, based on actual acquaintance between man and man, born of the daily living touch of men actually working together. It represented something higher and better than a mere money-wage. It represented *loyalty*, the devotion of man to man, the willing obedience to greater knowledge and higher ability, the sense of intelligent human co-working which sanctified and consecrated the strain of daily toil.

The nineteenth century ushered in a new industrial system. The great giants, Steam and Electricity, could not be profitably employed in the small industrial establishments of the past. The stock-company which made it possible for very many men to combine their individual capital in a common enterprise, was developed with startling rapidity. This union of large capital and of business energy, which the corporation effected, has called into life all the great enterprises of our century; but it has also given the death-blow to the old spirit of loyalty which prevailed between employer and employed and which, in fact, was the spiritual cement that held society together.

The corporation is owned by stockholders, frequently widely scattered, who are bound together only by the pages of the stock-ledger. In many companies these owners are only fleeting and temporary owners, holding the stock speculatively, buying to-day and selling to-morrow. The stockholders are represented by a board of directors who have the management, consisting of the president, the vice-president, the general manager, and so on. These again, in large companies, have their sub-officers, who finally come in contact with the men that do the actual physical work of the business. The purpose of the corporation is simply the earning of dividends. The directors, if they have one ear open to the claims of the workmen employed by the company, listen with a hundred ears to the demands of the stockholders whom they represent. They do

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not study the human hopes and needs which agitate their employees. They coldly study the credits and debits of the balance sheet. If earnings are large, the salaries of the president and of the manager may be increased, but the ordinary employee obtains no increase. If earnings decline, no cut is made in the salary of the officers, but they are instructed to reduce expenses. This means a reduced force, or reduced wages, or both. The reduction follows the line of least resistance. It falls on the powerless employee. In other words, the employee of a corporation is under the domination of an employer with whom he never comes in contact, before whom he has no voice, and from whom he can expect no consideration. He is simply a tool worth so many dollars a week so long as he is needed. How can any feeling of loyalty develop under such conditions? In any individual business, no matter how large, the employee, if he feels himself wronged, can as a last resource go straight to the head of the firm. But suppose the corporation-employee, if peradventure he could get a hearing, appealed to the president because of a reduction in his wages. The president, possibly expressing regret for the necessity of the reduction, would explain that the board of directors had decided the matter. The aggrieved employee could not get access to the board; but, even if he could, the directors would say that they were necessarily guided by the interests of the stockholders whom they represented. Is it not easy to comprehend that lack of genuine interest and ultimate antagonism are bound to take root where the tie of employment is a cold balance-sheet on the one hand and an uncertain monthly wage on the other?

A remedy must be found. Society cannot be tied together by dollar-bills. Yet corporate life and the concentration of capital in large enterprises are bound to continue and to expand. A new condition must be introduced which, in some degree, can take the place of the man-to-man loyalty of the past. To me there seems but one solution: *Make the employee loyal to the corporation; make him a stockholder and give him representation on the board of directors.*

Suppose a large corporation were to announce to its employees that, after a certain date, payment for services would be made at the rate of four-fifths in cash and one-fifth in stock of the company. It is at once evident that, if this labor-payment stock were not different from the regular stock of the company, the average American workman would, in his improvidence, soon transform it into money. This labor stock, therefore, should be made non-transferable, and void

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of value in case of sale or hypothecation. The non-transferability of this stock, on the other hand, should be offset by a guarantee that the company will redeem it at par. Should a labor stockholder voluntarily retire from the employ of a company, the option of a full year should be given for the redemption of his stock—to prevent embarrassment to a company in case a large number of employees should leave it simultaneously. The labor stockholders should be allowed to vote for one or more directors to represent them on the board. This representation would obtain for them a hearing before the controlling body, would tend to prevent hastily-considered action as affecting their welfare, and would enable them to receive direct, authentic information concerning the condition of the company. It is not necessary to discuss the details. The point I maintain is that, if the employees of a corporation are made stockholders, sharing in the prosperity and in the adversity of the company, having a voice in its management, and being fully informed as to the condition of the business, a spirit of co-ownership, of close personal interest, of loyalty, would be created which would make strikes most improbable, if not impossible. Every employee would feel that he was, to a degree, working for himself, that improved work would mean increased dividends and an increased value for his stock. His occupation would be invested with a deeper interest, a higher dignity. It would soon be recognized that it has been a waste of economic force to reduce man to the level of a tool. There must always be some incentive to call forth his best work, and there is no incentive like making him a sharer in the profits of his work.

We often hear an employer say: "My men want to work only eight hours, whereas I work ten or twelve or fourteen hours a day." But why is the employer willing to work so energetically? Because his extra work, as he believes, will result in extra profits. This incentive does not apply to the man who is employed for a fixed wage. He does not feel the spur which might energize him. He becomes dispirited, indifferent, careless. He does not give his best work because there is no heart in his work. But give him an interest in the profit resulting from his work, let him realize that increased economy and greater energy will bring an increase in his labor-return, fill him with a sense of co-partnership in the business, and you will have a transformed wage-earner.

Suppose the railroad employees engaged in the late strike had been stockholders in the railroads. Their impulse would have been to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

protect, not to destroy, the property of their respective companies. Their own self-interest would have been far better protection than United States troops. One of the commercial agencies estimates that the losses occasioned by the late strike will aggregate eighty-one millions. One-tenth of that sum held as stock-interests by the railroad employees would have made that strike an impossibility.

"But," says somebody, "your cure is simply profit-sharing." Yes, that is precisely what it is, coupled with a stockholding feature and with some voice in the management. In a way, it is not a new thing even in railroad management. The Paris and Orleans Railway in France tried it for many years, and it was extraordinarily successful until undue extensions and government interference destroyed its usefulness. Says Mr. Charles Robert:

"Applied as, for instance, it was in 1858 (this was fourteen years after its first introduction), association in the profits exercised a considerable influence on the *personnel* of the Orleans Company. The deep and lively feeling of a real and important solidarity of interests gave them the appearance of a great family. The employees looked after each other. They had constantly in mind the thought of an eventual profit to be shared, of a possible loss to be avoided. Thus every one showed the greatest care in handling baggage, and, if an employee treated it roughly, it was a common thing to have a comrade say to him: 'What are you about? You will shorten our dividend.'" See the excellent volume by Mr. Nicholas Paine Gilman, "Profit-Sharing," p. 218: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

In the Paris and Orleans Railway the employees had a profit-sharing but no stockholding interest. In none of the larger profit-sharing enterprises, so far as I know, has the stockholding plan been introduced, except in the *Bon-Marché*, the great mercantile establishment of Paris, which seems to be the most successful profit-sharing business ever attempted.

The great danger of the future is the socialistic danger. Its present expression is the rising tide in behalf of the nationalization of the railways. Make the railway operatives stockholders, and that question will magically disappear.

In this, as in all human actions, the policy of justice and of humanity will eventually be found to correspond and harmonize with cold self-interest. The best that is in men cannot be bought by a fixed money-wage, and it pays to get the best. When railroads and other great corporations take their employees into quasi-partnership by making them stockholders, and encourage their dignity and manhood by giving them representation on their directors' board, great strikes will be a thing of the past. LOUIS R. EHRICH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE READING HABITS OF ENGLISHMEN AND OF AMERICANS.

To arrive at any exact statement of the quantity and quality of the favorite reading-matter of a whole nation is manifestly impossible. The likes and dislikes, the hopes and ambitions, the secret strivings and the mental processes of men cannot be represented by numerals. An attempt to discover what the English read along such lines would have an air of accuracy and deceive the unwary by that very assumption. It is, however, by no means impossible to collate facts and figures, and to bring to bear subsidiary matters upon the subject, to such an extent that one may arrive at a fair general impression.

There are, to begin with, a percentage of people in every country who do not read at all, or very little; there are others whose incomes and employments indicate that they probably limit themselves to a certain kind of reading; while, more useful still in such a discussion, every nation has a certain personality of its own, from which one may judge that this or that special form of literature would be best suited to satisfy its literary curiosity.

When we come to divide up the population of England and Wales for the purpose of discovering even roughly the number of persons whose reading is of little consequence, we find that about thirteen millions fall into this class, including five million school-children under fourteen years of age; a million paupers; a-million-and-a-half domestic servants; nearly three million laborers in the agricultural, fishing, and mining industries; two millions engaged in textile manufactures or employed as tailors, milliners, seamstresses, and shoemakers; to say nothing of a hundred thousand lunatics (some of whom write!). Although, even here, it were unsafe to say that what these thirteen millions of people read has no influence upon themselves or upon others, it is at least fair to conclude that whatever that influence, subjective or objective, may be, it is of small consequence.

This condition of things is due: first, to the lack of free educational facilities for children over fourteen years of age—there are practically no facilities; second, to the lack of free libraries—of which,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

later; third, to a well-defined, and to an American strange, but widely held, opinion, that the secular education of the masses does more harm than good; fourth, to the discouraging lead of the classes in all matters of education over the even now heavily handicapped masses, which leads these latter to look upon their past and present condition as necessary and permanent.

The English compulsory free-school system is of very recent date as compared with the American public-school system, which is almost as old as the state itself. The total number of schools receiving annual grants is 19,398. The number of children on the register of the Education Department was, according to the last figures made public, 4,755,835, of whom 3,682,625 were, on an average, in daily attendance. Of these only about 43,000 were more than fourteen years of age. The reason for this remarkably small number of children above fourteen years of age is, that this is the limit of age when a child is required to attend school, and then, too, because, as has been said, there is no school machinery, and very little encouragement, in England, for the education of poor children who wish to go on beyond the usual curriculum of children of fourteen. The American system of free education, by means of which a lad may go on from primary school to grammar school, from grammar school to high school, and thence to college, without any expense for tuition and very little for text-books, does not exist in England.

The annual running expenses of the British Empire amount to about $450,000,000; out of this large sum the total amount spent upon all educational agencies of whatever description is only $29,201,455. The distribution of this fund is such that only a small percentage of the population of Great Britain are even in the way of fitting themselves to read anything but the most lamentably light and elementary literature. As a consequence of this policy, the percentage of adults who are, for all purposes of this discussion, practically illiterate, is probably very high. There are, unfortunately, no figures in the census returns which enable one to say exactly what that percentage is. The Home Office, however, in 1893, reported that of four-and-a-half-million total votes polled, one hundred and thirty-five thousand were illiterate. If one voter in every thirty-four is illiterate, one may be sure that, including the remaining women and children and non-voters, the percentage is very much higher; and these figures would be further borne out, did one care to make a calculation, from the fact that nearly 10 per cent of the men and nearly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

12 per cent of the women in England and Wales; nearly 5 per cent of the men and more than 8 per cent of the women in Scotland (the Scotch school system is vastly superior to that in England or Ireland); and more than 23 per cent of the men and more than 25 per cent of the women in Ireland,—could not sign the marriage register.

Another phase of the subject that deserves notice, and to which some attention must be paid, is this: A very large number of intelligent people in England are altogether opposed to free general education. They are the Conservative—not to say the Tory—Old Guard in politics and in religion, who hold that the children, as of old, in each parish, should be taught to read and write and to say their catechism in the schools under the supervision of the clergy, and then earn a living as did their forefathers. This system, which is still in vogue, explains why so many well-educated German youths are employed as clerks in London, to the dismay of their English rivals. One may lay aside for this once the bugaboo of the statistician, which is the ever-present fear of generalizing from details, and assert that it would be difficult to find an American who is utterly opposed to free education for the people—so long as it is not carried to a foolish length. In England, on the contrary, there is almost a party of reactionaries, who scout the very idea that the education of the lower classes has benefited either those who have received it or those who have bestowed it.

The following figures show better than any expression of opinion the difference between England and America in this matter. The census of 1891 counted 606,505 men, and 765,917 women, of sixty-five years of age and upwards, in England and Wales, or a total of 1,372,422, of whom 401,904, or nearly one-third, received parish relief. Yet, over against this fact of the masses going from bad to worse as they grow older, set this other statement, viz., that in 1874, in a House of Commons of 658 members, 235 of them were Oxford or Cambridge university men, and 100 of them graduates of Eton alone; and in the present House of Commons of 670 members, 371, or more than one-half, are graduates of the great universities; while in the United States Senate there are 14, and in the House of Representatives 22, graduates of our dozen more prominent colleges, 36 in all. It would be difficult to put it more clearly that in England the classes are educated and rule, while the masses have little voice in administrative matters, and fall towards the end of their lives into helpless and rheumatic dependence, while in America the general average of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prosperity is higher, though men of first-rate ability are probably fewer.

The last general fact, and perhaps not the least important, bearing upon this discussion, is the influence of climate upon reading. No doubt the mild and equable temperature of England, which enables one to be out-of-doors, and consequently to take part in some form of out-of-door sport or labor all the year round, lessens the amount of reading. Other things being equal the inhabitants of a mild climate will read less than people who are, perforce, kept indoors many weeks of the year. No country in the world has such a never-ending round of sport in which so large a proportion of the population takes an interest as has England,—bicycling, grown to enormous proportions, all the year round; hunting, from October till April; racing, from early Spring till late Autumn; golf, which has developed from a game into a widely prevalent disease, all the year round; cricket, and tennis, from May till late September; shooting, from August till October; foot-ball (played, alas! by professionals, but as many as twenty thousand people attending on one game), from September until May; and besides these, coursing, fishing, boating, and a long *et cætera* of other pastimes. Nor are these sports confined to the rich and idle, or even to the well-to-do alone. It must never be forgotten, even by the most fervent opponent of an aristocracy, that England is to-day the most democratic country in the world, where the rights of the individual are more respected, and where the individual has more of personal freedom, than anywhere else in Christendom; for to miss this characteristic is to lose the explanation of many apparent anomalies. His lordship, the squire, the parson, and the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick-maker go galloping across the fields together after the hounds. The meeting-place is advertised in the local papers, and it is not necessary to wear pink to join in the sport; and one may see such a mingling of classes on terms of purely equine equality as one seldom sees in America. The same is true of the cricket-field, where the country magnate, the parson, and the young squires of the neighborhood play under the captaincy of some local tradesman's son, proving again that the genuine aristocrat is the best democrat, and that the snob and the prig lack something of being gentlemen. Indeed, the only people one hears talking much of what it is, and what it is not, to be a gentleman in England—or in America either, for that matter—are they who half suspect their own claims to the title. It may give some idea of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

place of sport in English life to the sedentary American to say that it is difficult to find an Englishman between eighteen and sixty-five, in fair health and not supported by the rates, who is not a performer at some kind of sport or interested in some phase of it. Of the 673 reviews and magazines of a non-religious character printed in England, one in six is largely devoted to some form of out-of-door sport or occupation. Between 1880 and 1885, according to a private index kept in the British Museum, there were 266 books published on the one subject of sport or athletics; between 1885 and 1890, 412; and, although the figures for the last five years are not at hand, the number of books on the same subjects promises to be even larger—almost 40 books on golf alone appearing during the last five years. Nor does this list include books on topics germane to the subject, such as books dealing with voyages, geography, history, biography, and trade, of which there were 738 published in London in 1893 and probably more than a thousand during this last year. In a word, John Bull loves the fresh air. He is a sportsman, an athlete, a soldier, a sailor, a traveller, a colonist, rather than a student, and all the figures bear one out in making the statement. During those horrible days in the Crimea, these sport-loving "young barbarians" were "all at play," when they were not fighting; racing their ponies, getting up cricket-matches, and off shooting such game as there was. One family—the Pelhams—have hunted the Brocklesby pack of hounds for more than one hundred and seventy five years.

While Italy has twenty-one universities, Germany twenty, and France fifteen, each with a smaller population than England, England has only seven. On the other hand, the value of the sea-borne commerce of Great Britain and her colonies is $5,087,910,625, or double that of all other European countries combined, that of the United States being $1,866,280,000. The English control possessions in different parts of the world, aggregating 9,145,328 square miles in area, and 346,025,000 in population. They own foreign stocks to the amount of $3,819,035,000, or 23 per cent of all the foreign stocks in existence, yielding annually in interest $145,000,000, or at the rate of about $5.20 *per capita* of the whole population. A nation of students does not exploit itself along such lines. These people are the Romans of modern times, dull, vigorous, law-loving, law-abiding, and colonizers of the very finest quality, but not students.

When it is said that the English are, as compared with the Germans or even with their cousins in America, a non-reading race, we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have still to give the facts and figures concerning the reading population. To begin with, the census of 1891 for England and Wales groups under the heading, Professional Class, 926,132 persons; and of these it may be supposed that all are readers. Most startling of all, despite the fact that there are nearly a million more women than men in England, 555 in each 1,000 of the population are put down as unoccupied. This large unoccupied class in England—larger than that of any other country in Christendom—is due to the overcrowding—445 persons to the square mile in 1881, and 497 in 1891—and to the competition which forces people to be conservative and to be satisfied with a small but secure income, and to the civil-service system, which pensions off the servants of the state, there being 162,040 persons in England living upon state pensions amounting to $37,944,465 per annum. In this connection it is suggestive to find that there are more than 130,000 members of London clubs alone, and we are not far wrong in guessing that one man in every forty of voting age is a member of a club, not including workingmen's clubs, free reading-rooms and the like. These, and many more besides, are the devourers of the newspapers, sporting-papers, and the magazines. And this brings one to mention the position held by the newspapers of England in the national life of the country.

The newspaper is a member of the family in England, and regularly comes to breakfast with the other members. The London "Times" is a kind of oldest son amongst newspapers, and "Punch," the jolly bachelor uncle, who makes occasional visits. Englishmen take their newspapers into their confidence, and have a naïf way of writing to them on all sorts of subjects. If an Englishman rows down the Thames and stops for luncheon at an inn and is overcharged, he writes to his newspaper, just as a little boy runs in to complain to his mamma of the rough treatment of his playmates; and later on this first letter is followed by others, in which the comparative merits and cost of light luncheons on the continent, in Seringapatam, in Kamchatka, and everywhere else where Englishmen have eaten and drunk—and where have they not done these?—is discussed *au fond*. If horses stumble and fall in Rotten Row, there are letters on the subject which go into the matter of road-building, modern horsemanship, and the like, with quotations from Virgil and anecdotes of accidents that happened half a century ago. Half a dozen Englishmen go to Homburg. Finding that the golf links there are not to their taste, they sign a round-robin on the subject and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

send it to the "Times." Of late there have been many letters concerning the lynching of Negroes in our Southern States, and here again John Bull, with his ponderous disregard of the fact that he knows nothing at first hand, delivers himself naïvely, as usual, of his superficial omniscience. Not only the more serious weekly but also the daily newspapers give one the impression that they feel themselves to some extent responsible for the contemporary auditing of the accounts of the Day of Judgment. On the other hand, the better-class English newspapers do not indulge in rash suppositions, hasty generalizations, uncertain guesses at probable future happenings, and the daily exploitation of the personal affairs of notorious nobodies. And one may be permitted to say diffidently that perhaps this is preferable. If Mr. Balfour, for example, were to go abroad for a holiday, it would be considered vulgar to chronicle his doings and dinings, and absolutely brutal and boorish to write particulars of the dress and behavior of his sister—or of his wife, if he had one. The sense of fair-play of a nation of sportsmen does not permit an editor to torment even his enemy from behind a woman's petticoats.

There is no way of knowing with any exactness the comparative amount of newspaper-reading in England and America; but it is undoubtedly true that the Englishman takes his newspaper much more seriously than the American—first, because his newspaper is more accurate and more carefully written; and then, because the Englishman takes everything more seriously—even Mark Twain; and most notable of all, because of the wider sweep of interest, and the broader horizon offered to the English newspaper-reader, due simply to the fact that all the news and every interest of the whole British Empire are centered in London; and because, too, all Imperial politics are settled finally, not in forty-four different States, but in London. The English newspapers are, therefore, to be taken seriously into account when one estimates what, and to what purpose, English people read. Englishmen are *par excellence* the most careful travellers of the world. Men who are to write and men who hope to rule look upon a trip around the world as a necessary part of their curriculum. This reacts upon their newspapers and magazines, which receive weighty communications from experts, wherever a British interest is threatened, and whenever the British lion's paw is suspected of being used to roast somebody else's chestnuts. Nothing does more to keep up the tone of the daily press than this intimate and serious interest that so many Englishmen take in their newspapers, while the wide and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

varied interests of Imperial control—there is seldom a month when the army or navy of Great Britain is not in active service in some part of her wide dominions—give to the newspapers an heroic cast and a dramatic concern which in themselves supply the place of other literature. Therefore it is that, in casting about to discover what the English people read, one gives great weight to the fact that they are a nation who take their newspapers seriously, and in reading them become possessed of a great variety of information, and in the main accustomed to a sound style of writing and thinking. There are something like 1,882 newspapers published in England and Wales.

Judging, then, from these diverse facts brought to bear upon what the English read, what are we led to expect? What would such a fellow as John Bull read? Newspapers, novels, particularly novels of sport, adventure and travel, and, next, travels, history, biography, exploration, and then—because the great bulk of the English are Puritan still—books of a religious character. An analytical table of books which were published in London in 1892 and 1893 shows the following:

	1892.		1893.	
	New Books.	New Editions.	New Books.	New Editions.
Theology	528	145	459	74
Novels and Fiction	579	115	518	104
Political Economy, Trade	151	24	71	14
Voyages, Geography	250	86	247	72
History, Biography	293	75	269	65
Poetry, Drama	185	42	197	37
Belles Lettres, Essays	107	32	96	11
Sport	72	....	75	....

Out of this list of 2,309 books published in London in 1893, 1,435 of them were devoted to fiction, travel, biography, history, and sport.

To an American, particularly if he live in be-libraried Massachusetts, it must seem strange that, in writing of what John Bull reads, no use is made of library statistics. But when it is said that the first rate-supported library in England was opened to the public only in 1852, and that there are now only 165 such libraries, it becomes apparent how small a factor is this. In Massachusetts alone 248 of the 351 cities and towns have free public libraries, and there are besides 23,000 school libraries in the United States, containing 45,000,000 volumes. A careful calculation shows that in 106 out of the total of 165 lending libraries in England, there were, in 1893, 389,698 net borrowers; and of these, on the average, nearly 80 per cent called for fiction and juvenile literature, and therefore what

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some 78,000 readers of the free lending libraries read, even if one could know, would be of small service in telling what the English people read. Mudie's Select Library and Smith's Lending Library have some 60,000 subscribers and probably 250,000 readers, and here again one-third of the books they distribute are novels.

In short, the only method which results, or can result, in anything like a satisfactory answer to the question, what the English people read, is the broad method of dealing with the nation as a whole. Doubtless there is here or there a governess writing a "Jane Eyre"; or a schoolboy wasting his time in preparing to write a "Vanity Fair"; or a dull boy at his arithmetic, who will some day be called The Grand Old Man, and make poetry of future budgets; or a young fop in Piccadilly, who may seem to belong to the class of non-readers, and yet who is destined to receive £10,000 for another "Lothair" and to make his Queen an Empress—who knows? At any rate we are not so enamoured of our figures, but we raise our hat to these exceptions to our rules. These countless exceptions to any and to every rule, the undoubted prowess of English scholars, and the maintenance of an uncommonly high average tone in matter, manner, and method in the English newspapers and periodicals prove fairly enough that, though the English nation is not a nation of readers, there must be a percentage by no means small, who demand, and who succeed in getting, a high class of reading matter for their daily consumption. On the other hand, it is equally fair to say that the 28,000,000 inhabitants of a small island, who offer no facilities for the higher education of the poorer classes, who have a million paupers, a-million-and-a-half domestic servants, three million out-of-door laborers, two million working in mills, factories, and shops, and who have conquered and rule a population *in partibus*, outnumbering them twelve to one, cannot be spoken of as a nation of readers.

To one who is looking for a pat and hard-and-fast answer to the question "What do the English read?" the answer may seem to be lacking. It is not. The great bulk of the English read nothing, literally nothing, and he who knows something of rural England will agree to this; the casual and occasional reader reads, as we have shown, fiction, biography, history, travels, and no small amount of theology in a diluted form; the great middle class read, and trust, their periodical literature and their newspapers; the students, the real readers, who feed their minds as other men their bodies, read with more thoroughness and patience than our students. The entrance examina-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions for any college at Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, or Dublin is trifling as compared with the entrance examination for Harvard University, but on the other hand both the classical and mathematical men who take the highest rank here go through an amount of reading that our men hardly dream of. England has nothing like the number of averagely well-read men that one finds in America; but America has nothing like the number of thoroughly well-read, widely-travelled, highly trained men in politics, and in all the professions, that one finds here. In America there is a widespread education of the hare; in England there is, confined to narrow limits, the education of the tortoise, and there is a fable that the world is poised upon the back of a tortoise! At any rate England carries a very heavy proportionate rate of the world's responsibility, and England and America together would seem to have little to fear from the future, for, after all, what men read is not a crucial test of their capacity. Who has not known men with enough university sheepskin to make a wardrobe of, who were vacillating incompetents? Who forgets how small were the libraries and the opportunities of Washington, Lincoln, and Grant? The English people are slow; in the main, dull; and they care little for abstractions in print; but if Mr. Benjamin Kidd's view of social evolution be correct, and the consensus of the competent apparently favors it, then the prosperity of a nation is not dependent primarily upon its intellectual alertness; and John Bull has little to fear from his lack of book-learning and his love of the open air.

PRICE COLLIER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IS THE WEST DISCONTENTED? A LOCAL STUDY OF FACTS.

I AM asked to prepare for THE FORUM an article on the contented classes in Nebraska. The task is undertaken with pleasure, yet with no little trepidation. It is no small matter to run counter to public opinion; and especially to public opinion east of the Alleghanies. So much occurs west of the Mississippi that is really extraordinary, all conditions of life and growth are so wholly unlike those of the extreme East, that those who have had no personal experience in Western life may easily be divided into two classes: those who believe everything that they hear, and those who believe nothing that they hear. Both these classes seem to believe that extreme unrest and unreasoning and widespread discontent are our prevailing political, financial, commercial, and social characteristics.

There is need, perhaps, at the outset, of some fair, working definition of the word "contented." This ought not to exclude reasonable ambition,—the willingness and desire to change for the better; intelligent dissatisfaction with many existing social, civil, and political conditions. It may even include temporary discouragement, and perhaps take in a little reasonable and very natural grumbling about "hard times," "class legislation," "tariff-tinkering," "gold-bugs," and "silver cranks,"—according to the geographical or political locality of the grumbler. But it will not include that spirit which declares anything preferable to the present status, and substitutes revolution for evolution. Nor will it cover that other spirit—or want of spirit—that leads some men to forget their manliness; to declare that they have no chance in the world; that there is but sixpence a day difference between the man who works and the man who does not, and that the man who does not work generally gets the sixpence; that the struggle for existence is entirely hopeless; that they are "enslaved" by somebody or to something; that the world owes them a living, and that they propose by idleness to collect the debt.

The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to determine what proportion of Nebraska's population comes under the definition of "contented" as thus set forth. My duties as Chancellor of the State University have called me into nearly every town of prominence and my

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

executive journal shows about 10,000 miles' travel per year within the State. The purpose of this journeying has been to inspect the high schools which are accredited to the University; to attend farmers' Institutes and the meetings of the various State industrial and educational organizations; to make addresses in local lecture-courses or on various occasions; and to consult with people of influence concerning educational affairs. One evening I have "assisted" at a reception in which *personnel*, toilets, and manners would do credit to any city in the Union. On the next I have addressed a farmers' Institute in a little country town, and after the exercises have ridden nine miles in a farm wagon, wrapped up in a bed-quilt, with the thermometer ten degrees below zero, to spend the night with a farmer friend. I have talked with people in their stores and workshops, by the roadside, at their homes, in conventions, at church, and in school. The subjects of conversation have been almost as numerous as the people thus encountered. Because the University and its executive are entirely "out of politics," men and women have talked with me more freely than is usual except with warm personal friends. Many things have been said in confidence which the speakers would not repeat in public or even to a very few persons. It is no small advantage to come in contact during every academic year with 1,300 or 1,400 of the children of these people. In their relations to each other, in the way in which they go about their work, in the subjects upon which they write, in the questions which they debate, in their thinking and in the utterance of their thoughts, they reflect the home life pretty clearly. It is from this close and almost confidential relationship that the inferences and conclusions of this paper are drawn.

It is safe to say that there is a district school, representing the free State system, within walking distance of every Nebraska home. The last report of the State Superintendent shows 377 graded schools, of which about 70 are accredited to the University for more or less of the work preparatory to that institution, and probably 100 teach Latin and some advanced mathematics. There are 10 private or denominational colleges of more or less reputation and standing, 10 private academies, and 6 private normal schools. In addition to these facilities for higher education the State maintains the University, with three colleges now established and an enrolment of over 1,300 students, and the State Normal School, where opportunity is given to prepare for teaching. The last official report of the State Superintendent showed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over 6,000 public school houses, with nearly 5,000 districts holding six months' school or more.

All this has come to the territory practically within thirty years, or somewhat less than a single generation. That the people have not been able to do this unaided is shown by the fact that 54 per cent of the taxed acres and about 25 per cent of the taxed lots are mortgaged. It is not believed, however, that the State has exceeded 30 per cent of the greatest possible real-estate mortgage debt. The greater portion of our population came into the territory with little or no means, and has taken part in its development with slight resources other than an infinite capacity for hard work and that integrity of character which assures credit. On the whole the people are what are known as the common people; though one must confess that the common people with us are the most uncommon common people the world has ever seen. It is not probable that they have entered very deliberately or very consciously upon the task of State building. Each man has worked upon the wall against his own door until the defences of the city are complete. There has been a large amount of independent thinking and independent action. As the people have been drawn together in the towns, unity of purpose and definiteness of plan have developed; but we are still scattered and lacking in the strength derived from closeness of contact, man with man.

As to their manner of life, there would seem to be no better method of inquiry and investigation than to take concrete cases of which the most, and most accurate, information can be secured. If these cases are normal and typical, then inference and conclusion will come naturally and safely. Let us take, then, the city of Lincoln as fairly typical of the average Western town of its size; remembering that it is the second city of Nebraska. It has a population of 55,000. The use of the electric railway enables the city to spread out in every direction, and it probably covers three or four times the territory which would be occupied by an Eastern city of the same size. This means that in the residence portion there are almost no blocks of connected houses or tenements. In the very poorest part of the city there may be two houses to the lot (50 feet frontage) which gives from 8 to 10 feet between the houses, but even then the front of the house is from 15 to 20 feet from the sidewalk. There are, I think, only five, so-called, blocks of connected tenements or flats (rented houses); but these happen to be in the best part of the city and bring perhaps the highest rentals known in Lincoln. Very generally,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

therefore, there is one residence to a fifty-foot lot, and often the premises are even larger. The houses set back from the street and the streets are 100 feet wide. It will be seen that all these conditions give breathing-room and are conducive to health and comfort. It is a city of churches and schools; it has an excellent water system, miles of well-paved streets, electric lights and gas, a successful sewer system, a fine government building, two of the best opera-houses in the West, and several parks and pleasure-resorts.

The most costly residence portion is on and around Capitol hill. It is hardly likely that there will be much discontent here. It will be better, therefore, to take an average street and examine somewhat into its condition and that of its people. Let us take, then, one with which the writer is very familiar, four blocks north of the main business thoroughfare, and running directly through the University grounds east and west.

At the head of this street, lives a family of which the parents are of German birth and the children all American-born. Those now at home are the father, mother, and six sons. The oldest son is the business-manager of one of the evening papers, in which the father is a bookkeeper. Another son is an accountant in the University, one practises law, one is studying medicine, one is a post-graduate student and instructor in the University, where also the youngest is a student. The post-graduate student and the youngest son are employed on the newspaper during the vacation, and in other spare time. All are intelligent, industrious, frugal, temperate, and reasonably successful. They are undoubtedly ambitious for better things, but certainly cannot be said to be "discontented." Their nearest neighbor on the west is a practising physician and surgeon, one of the most successful in the city. He is on the governor's staff as surgeon-general of the State militia, takes considerable part and interest in public affairs, and is a very good all-around citizen. It would be hard to find a more contented or happy family than he and his wife and children appear to be. On the next lot is a comparatively small residence, occupied by an old gentleman with his wife and one or two of their younger children. They live in a very quiet way, and have a few rooms that they rent to students or others, and, so far as one can learn by occasional conversation, they seem to think this world a pretty good place in which to live and are in no hurry to leave it even though they have seen so much of it. Just beyond, on the corner, is a neat one-story cottage, occupied by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a very old lady, who is partially, if not entirely, supported by her son. She may be seen quite frequently out in the garden among her flowers, which are chiefly noted for their old-fashioned names and colors. She has been a teacher and certainly loves nature and little children, and I feel pretty sure that nature and little children love her. I have never heard a word of discontent from her lips, though she may think the world is all awry, but if so, she does not show it.

Next to her home is a three-story frame residence just being completed. I have often stopped and talked with the workmen while the building has been going on. Of the two carpenters who are now finishing this work, one rides home every evening with his wife, who comes for him with a very neat little pony and phaeton, and is often accompanied by a bright-faced boy, evidently their son. I know where they live and how they live, and I think they are very good examples of American manhood and womanhood in what we sometimes falsely call the middle class—really the best class that we have. I know they read together evenings, and that he is reasonably well-informed in public affairs, and I do not believe that he is quarrelling with himself or his neighbors. His companion, a Swede, says he is discontented; he thinks the lot of the laboring man harder here than in the old country; and if he could get away he would certainly go back. Asked as to the cause of this dissatisfaction, he replied that at first he received large wages and thought he could soon own a home; that he had finally purchased it, but was somewhat in debt; that he disliked the continual paying of interest; and that now he did not get work enough to pay off what he owed. In the old country, he said with much apparent pride, he could not run in debt, he would have no credit, and he would be expected to rent and to remain a tenant. The man who was in charge and did most of the mason-work is an Englishman who seems entirely satisfied to have exchanged countries, and who feels himself a much freer and more hopeful man here than he could possibly have been at the old home. The one painter in whom I have taken enough interest to lead into somewhat prolonged conversation is a University student who is earning money during the summer to proceed with his work next fall. He is discontented: but it is chiefly the discontent which comes to the average intelligent American citizen because men of so little real worth so often find their way into public place and power. In fact, I think he is one of those horrible examples of the effects of higher education, which so constantly tends to make "independents" and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"mugwumps." In the little story-and-a-half cottage next to this new house live the young man and the young woman who are building this home as a venture. The husband is a shipping-clerk for one of the large wholesale grocers of the city. His wife was, before marriage, a professional nurse with a long head and a warm heart. After their marriage she opened a students' club, and by good management has aided her husband in accumulating money with which to undertake the building of this University club-house. If she is not broken in health by over-work they will soon own this property free from debt, and will find it a source of more than fair revenue. They are busy and successful people, and such are rarely discontented.

Beyond them, still toward the University, are four or five small single-story or story-and-a-half cottages, occupied chiefly by men who labor "by the day." The only exception, I think, is a member of the fire department, whose wages are perhaps $50 a month. I do not know all these people, but I have not passed their homes four times a day for three years without learning much about them. There are children who are neatly dressed and who seem in good health and spirits. There are signs of comfort in the way of lawns and lawn-sprinklers, hammocks, window-screens, and fresh dresses for afternoon and evening. There is a good deal of companionship and neighborliness which speak of comfort and home-keeping. I have not heard these people complain, nor do I believe that they do.

Across the street is a larger house with larger grounds, occupied by a gentleman who is known as a capitalist; though I suspect his capital is not very large. There is every appearance of comfort, and as I meet him from time to time he seems cheerful and hopeful. On the next lot is a home in which lives a family consisting of father, mother, and three daughters. The youngest girl is still in the public school; the oldest is a graduate of the State University and is earning her way through the Albany (N. Y.) School of Library Economy; the second daughter is still a student at the University, and often sets type in order to meet her expenses. The father has some position upon one of the weekly papers, while the mother adds to the family income by caring for the few upper rooms in their house, which are rented to students or others. This family is thoroughly discontented—with intemperance, and with bad government, city, State and national; but it is about as intelligent discontent as one could readily find. I know them well enough to be sure that with all their material limitations they find life well worth the living, and make it better

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

worth the living every day. Adjoining them is the residence of the city ticket-agent of one of the railway lines. He is a "rustler," as they say in this Western country; works hard, early and late; thinks his road is the best in the world; never lets a point in the business game escape him; and is steadily rising in the favor of his employers and of the community. He keeps a quiet family horse, which he drives with an easy phaeton; and he makes much of his wife and children,—and they make much of him. There is no discontent there.

The two blocks nearer the University are occupied in much the same way. There is a row of cottages which is given over chiefly to Germans. I am sure they enjoy life, for I see them enjoy it every day. The evening paper is thrown upon the porches; again there are the small lawns, flowers, and hammocks; and there are at least two pianos and one reed organ. On one of the porches I have noticed quite late at night two young people. They are not distinctly visible, for they are generally in the shadow of the porch, and there seems some confusion of outlines; but from what I happen to hear at times I suspect there is not much discontent there. In another house lives an old lady, comfortably supported by a daughter who is a stenographer. In the adjoining home there are two daughters who are clerks in one of the retail dry-goods stores. Several of these people let rooms; two of the best houses are owned by the man who built them, who is a mechanic, yet has managed to accumulate enough to be a landlord; in one of the others is a member of our Faculty; in another a newspaper man; another is occupied by a man who is a track-master and mechanic for one of our railway lines, but who owns his own house and I think three others in the vicinity; and in another lives an expert boiler-maker, who receives high wages.

Now I think these people, in their material conditions and surroundings and in their life and temper, are fair samples of the people who make up a Nebraska city or town. There are a few—a very few—streets in Lincoln that will doubtless show less comfort and less courage, greater limitations, more hopelessness, and more real suffering than does the one just described. But it is only fair to say that they will reveal also less intelligence, less will-power, less industry, less character; though it is often hard to tell which is cause and which is effect,—these two are so intimately connected and act and react so continuously on each other. On the other hand there are many portions of the city in which all the conditions of easy, com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fortable, and contented life seem more distinctly present than in that section which I have tried to sketch. The latter certainly lies very close to the average line.

These conditions are practically those of the minor cities, towns, and villages; each, as compared with the city, minimized, photographed down, or looked at through the wrong end of the telescope. There are hundreds of communities in the State in which there is not a single family that can be called poor, in the sense in which that word would be used regarding a certain class of the population in New York, Boston, and Philadelphia. It is quite true also that none is rich, but one needs not more than a half hour's rapid walk about town to assure him that all are comfortable and that most are contented. Life is plain and simple, and even devoid of interest to those of us whose palates have been cloyed by the more highly spiced existence of a metropolis. But it brings much pleasure and solid comfort to those whose lines are cast in these quiet places. I know a banker who is also a good all-around citizen in his little town; being a member of the school board, a superintendent of one of the Sunday schools, president of a bicycle club, an active member of a gun club, and leader in the village band. I believe he gets more real enjoyment out of life, and in his way and place ministers more largely to the comfort and well-being of his fellows, than many whose names stand high among State or national officials. I know another, a householder and home-maker, who is superintendent of the city schools, organizer and leader in a branch of one of the great fraternal associations, a class-leader in his church, a stockholder in two small manufacturing enterprises and in one bank, and a member of the city council; and I am sure that he is a successful and a "contented" man, in any reasonable or true sense of that word. Such instances can be recalled almost without number in all the minor towns.

When one considers the agricultural part of our population there seems at first sight room for wide divergence of opinion because of an apparent wide divergence of conditions. Although this half of our population is carrying the heaviest burden in the fact that it deals altogether with a raw material (which always puts a man at a disadvantage), and suffers by shrinkage of currency, change of values, bad financiering at Washington, and frequent instances of bad government at home, it is, on the whole, gaining ground and strength from year to year. The last three years have been especially hard upon these people, and undoubtedly the greatest—and most natural—dis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

content is to be found in their ranks. It is true that a large number of them have undertaken agriculture with but little experience and almost no definite preparation and training for the work, and also that many who have had much experience have not the keenest intelligence. It is true that under one form of inducement or another many have undertaken agriculture in districts better fit, if not fit only, for grazing, and that many add to their lack of preparation, of training and of intelligence, positive idleness and shiftlessness. But it is also unquestionably true that there are large numbers of experienced, intelligent, industrious, hard-working, God-fearing men and women who, living with an enforced frugality which comes dangerously near absolute want, have found it a difficult task to make ends meet during the last few years. Some of them doubtless have lost hope; but even under the most discouraging conditions the percentage is very small which really falls under our definition of discontent,—the kind our Eastern friends think so prevalent. It is not probable that the hard times have borne much more heavily upon the farmers during the last few years than upon business men of all classes; but the farmers as a whole have had less reserve power with which to meet the struggle. Even in Nebraska, however, there have been fewer men sold off from their farms than have been sold out of their stores; there has been less money lost, in proportion to the amount lent, by those who have given credit to farmers than by those who have extended credits in the business world; and it is not too much to say that there has been more honesty and manliness in connection with financial transactions among farmers than among those in the business world. The farmer who can fail, yet continue to live as extravagantly as before, keeping his horses, carriages, and servants, and his place in all social functions, is a rare sight.

In order to make assurance doubly sure, I sent out a circular letter of inquiry regarding "discontent," to a hundred gentlemen of my personal acquaintance, who are fair representatives of the different sections, of the different political parties, and of the different material interests of the State. They were not chosen because I knew what they would write, but because I knew they would write honestly and intelligently and fearlessly. In this circular I expressed the thought that the normal condition of American life is certainly that of reasonable prosperity and rational contentment. I admitted, as we all ought to admit, the dissatisfaction of which every one must know something; but that we certainly ought also to know some-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thing in a clear and definite way of the high purpose and strong hopefulness which must be prevailing. Each letter contained a list of twenty-six questions, to which I asked thoughtful and careful answers, without reference to the present crop-failure, which is a local disaster and temporary in its effects. The questions covered such subjects as the population of the city or county from which the report was asked; the nationality of the population; the local indebtedness; for what this indebtedness was incurred; the percentages of the people owning their homes or farms, of those heavily in debt, of those reasonably well-to-do, of those reasonably successful in their undertakings, of those better off now than they were ten or fifteen years ago; how many are able to give their children much better opportunities (social and educational) than they themselves enjoyed when young; how many are given to talking in a discontented way, how many of these deeply and sincerely feel as they talk, how many of the people are really and seriously discontented, and what are the reasons and remedies for this discontent. There was, of course, much room for the exercise of individual judgment and opinion, for inference and conclusion on the part of the writers; but such reports were exceedingly helpful in preparing this statement.

The reports, with very few exceptions, confirm almost absolutely the conclusions that I have drawn. They differ somewhat in detail, and they certainly differ as between the urban and rural populations. But in all main points they agree, and upon some there is absolute unanimity. For instance, there seems to be no question that the people of this State are almost to a family better off than they were ten or fifteen years ago. As far as being able to give their children better educational advantages than the parents enjoyed, all correspondents answer that the educational systems of the present are far in advance of those of the past, and that the child of the humblest citizen has better opportunities to-day than most of the children of even the well-to-do classes of fifty years ago. There is a little feeling along social lines that the distinction of class is more observable than a few years ago; but this is so slight in Nebraska as to be scarcely noticeable. As to those who have been at least reasonably successful in their undertakings,—taking the years as they go—it would seem that the general opinion is about 80 per cent. When one recalls Abbot Lawrence's statement, drawn from his long observation in the business world, that 90 per cent of those who go into business fail once, 80 per cent twice, and 70 per cent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

three times, the latter going out of business altogether or else remaining as employees, it will be seen that the people of Nebraska are fully up to the average. If we understand by "very busy people" those whose time is fully employed in the fairly profitable affairs of life, the percentage seems to reach 85. If we understand by those who "take life easily and with reasonable comfort," those who are able to live without daily labor or effort or definite occupation of some kind, the percentage is very small. If, on the other hand, we refer to those who, by daily labor or systematic effort of perhaps eight hours, provide themselves and their families with the reasonable comforts of life, the percentage would show possibly 70 or 75. If we mean by those who are "reasonably well-to-do," those who own a farm of 80 or 160 acres, paid for or not encumbered for more than 20 or 25 per cent of its real value; or those who have a fairly successful, well-established business or profession; the percentage seems to be about 60. Very generally the children or young people are not drawn from the schools before the age of fifteen; and the percentage of those attending high schools, academies, and institutions of higher learning is quite as great as will be found in any of the older States. Our people realize that the times demand young men and young women who have the mental development, strength, and alertness which result from sound education. The increasing recognition of this is attested by the fact that in the State University the attendance has risen in three years from less than 500 to nearly 1,400; and by the further fact that even the hard times and the drought do not make any noticeable decrease in those numbers. All the public indebtedness of the State and of the counties and different localities has been incurred for public improvements. In Nebraska, as everywhere, there are always more or less carelessness and incompetency in the expenditure of such funds; but the reports seem to indicate that full value has been generally received, and that there is very little if any complaint because of such indebtedness. I have yet to hear a single instance of repudiation from any quarter of Nebraska. Our people feel that money thus borrowed for the purpose of erecting school-houses, churches, court-houses and other public buildings, is money well invested, and they will repay it.

I took pains to ask my correspondents to answer with more than usual care the questions, to which reference has already been made, referring to the discontent of the people of their several communities. The replies do not vary greatly, but where they do they are extreme

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in their divergence. Possibly five correspondents put the number of the discontented at from 80 per cent upwards of the population, and ten others say from 20 to 30 per cent. All the rest agree, however, that only from 3 to 5 per cent of the entire population are really and seriously "discontented." There is a general admission that a large number are given to talking in a discontented way. Unquestionably there is greater freedom of speech and there is a more general habit of criticism in Nebraska than in Maine or Massachusetts. But this only illustrates the saying that "freedom flourishes in the colonies." The people of Nebraska expect more and demand more than do many others; they feel that there may be and ought to be more in life for them than there is; they are more eager for financial success and material comfort, and more impatient at anything which looks like an unequal distribution of the results of productive toil. It is, therefore, but natural that they should be misunderstood by those who are somewhat more apathetic, to whom a change of theological or political creed seems like revolution itself, who "view with alarm" every forward movement of humanity, and who are more ready to accept the settled order of things as the only possible condition of existence. Such people naturally look upon any criticism and any real freedom of speech and action with distrust and suspicion, when these are positively healthful signs.

This, then, seems to be the conclusion of the whole matter. There is some discontent within the limits of Nebraska. In a new State, and especially in a rich State like our own, where all natural resources seem to be within the easy grasp of each and all, there have been great opportunities for acquiring a competence and even wealth. In most of these Western States money-getting has been easy. In the pursuit of wealth, some, by reason of extraordinary diligence, extraordinary shrewdness, or good fortune, have been more successful than others. With the unsuccessful, even though they have done more than fairly well, the sense of not being as far along in the race as those with whom they made the start is irritating. The rapid rise in values has unquestionably unsettled many men and made them discontented with conditions which we all know to be more nearly normal. The tenth commandment is undoubtedly often and badly shattered in Nebraska; but I fancy we are neither the only sinners nor the chief of sinners in this respect. Our people do not always wait to be deprived of necessaries before they complain, but are apt to speak, and speak sharply, if what may be termed the lavishness of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

supply is lessened. Men here, as elsewhere, are in haste to get rich; not simply to secure a competence. With many others the present complaining is hereditary, and comes to them with their New England blood. Most well-organized, normal New Englanders are always "on the road to the poor-house." The only difference between New England and Nebraska seems to be that, whereas in the former people go cheerfully and willingly and seem rather to enjoy the prospect (they rarely get there, of course,—those who are always talking about it never do), their descendants in Nebraska, with the same prospect in view and entertaining it just as sincerely as do their ancestors (which is not sincerely at all), grow rebellious at the very thought. With all this, however, it is quite a difficult task to avoid making out a case for contentment in one's own locality when the existing facts and conditions are studied carefully and in detail. Suffering, deprivation, and discontent are much like the ague,—"over in the next township"; and it is not at all unusual to find an audience applauding a speaker who tells them they are pauperized, when very few men in the audience would part with their possessions short of a sum represented by a big unit and three ciphers.

The discontent which really does exist, however, to any great extent and with any great power, is not so much discontent with one's individual lot as with the existing order of things. In our haste to build an empire in a night, we have not always guarded carefully the interests of all the people. We have only ourselves to blame for this; and part of our present ill-humor comes from a secret consciousness of this fact. Much, if not all, legal inequality might have been prevented by wise forethought and unselfish action on our part. It would sometimes seem as though our children could not possibly govern themselves any worse than we have governed ourselves, and that if they do not vastly improve in all methods of public administration they will suffer more than we do.

Out of such bitter experiences, however, and out of this kind of rational discontent, are evolved all human improvement and all advancement of the race. This kind of discontent seems to have naturally and properly become a powerful factor in American public life. But as for ourselves and our neighbors as individuals, and in our own individual and private interests and affairs, it is safe to say that 95 per cent of the people of this State fall easily under any thoughtful definition of the expression "contented classes."

J. H. CANFIELD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WILL POLYGAMISTS CONTROL THE NEW STATE OF UTAH?

SIX times the people of the Territory of Utah have formulated a constitution and submitted it to Congress with an application for Statehood. Every time their petition has been refused. The seventh proposed constitution, framed in accordance with the "enabling act" passed by the last Congress, will be prepared and presented to President Cleveland for his acceptance or rejection during the coming year. For more than twenty years the Territory has had population and wealth sufficient to entitle it to a place in the Union. The population to-day is greater than the combined populations of the three adjoining States of Nevada, Idaho, and Wyoming. But for the institution of polygamy Utah would long ago have become a State.

It is now four years since the practice of polygamy was renounced by the Mormon people, in conference assembled, and the political party which united them was formally dissolved. The Liberal, or anti-Mormon, party continued its existence till November, 1893, when it, too, disbanded. Mormons and Gentiles, heretofore grouped into parties by local questions only, now ranged themselves by national questions and became members of one or the other of the great parties of the land. With one accord all the people of Utah, irrespective of politics or religion, petitioned Congress for admission as a State.

The action of the Mormons in renouncing a fundamental tenet of their religion and disbanding their political party, at the bidding of their leaders, is without a parallel in our history. The question naturally arises, Might not this people, at the dictate of their Church authorities, with the same unanimity and readiness resume the practice of polygamy and combine again for political control of the local government, when Utah has become a State? True, under the enabling act the new constitution must inhibit polygamy; but statutory penalties and local enforcement are required to make any law effective. Would it not be easy for a Mormon legislature practically to nullify this provision of the constitution? Is it not possible, indeed, that in their zeal for Statehood the Gentiles of Utah are blind to the dangers that their action invites?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These are questions that many people outside Utah are asking. Their apprehensions are intensified by echoes from the present political campaign in Utah, in which Republicans and Democrats are trying to outbid each other for the Mormon vote. Nor is this solicitude allayed by the announcement that the late Territorial conventions of both parties unanimously favored woman suffrage,—an institution which existed in Utah for seventeen years and proved to be one of the strongest bulwarks of polygamy. To arrive at a definite conclusion it is necessary briefly to consider the recent history of the Territory.

Polygamy was never regarded by the Gentiles of Utah with the same degree of abhorrence that it excited elsewhere in the world. The local Gentile hostility to the institution, it is true, was fierce and unrelenting. Yet Mormons who had been convicted and sentenced to the penitentiary for the crime of polygamy were never regarded by Gentiles with the aversion felt for other criminals. They were looked upon rather as blind and devoted adherents to a mistaken principle. In prison they were treated with respectful consideration by the guards and officials, and as far as possible they were employed as "trusties." The Gentiles attached no particular stigma to Mormons who had served sentences for polygamy, and by their own sect, of course, they were honored as heroes and martyrs. Quite different, however, was the feeling outside the Territory. The bitterest indignation prevailed against the iniquitous doctrine, and those who practised it or even believed in it were regarded as monsters. Tourists who came to Utah looked upon the Mormons with curious awe, and not infrequently with genuine fear.

Deeper than the resentment felt by the Gentiles of Utah against polygamy was that aroused by the union of Church and State in the Territory. The Church authorities have always strenuously denied that they exercised political power. Whether they did or did not, the effect was the same. In politics the Church was a unit. In business the distinction was less closely drawn, but most Mormon trade went into Mormon channels. This union of religion, business, and civil government awakened here, as it must anywhere, the fiercest opposition. This union of Church and State, however, was not the kind of evil that could be used with best advantage by the Gentiles in appealing to the whole Union. But polygamy satisfied this need because it shocked the moral sense of civilization. Consequently polygamy was made the scapegoat upon which the anti-Mor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mon population of Utah piled its combined grievances. Another class in the Territory joined with yet keener zest in the popular hue and cry against polygamy. Officials sent from the Eastern States to official positions in the Territory as a reward for party service found indiscriminate denunciation of the Mormons an excellent method of perpetuating political power. It is notorious that not a few who came to Utah poor men enriched themselves at the expense of the Mormon Church. The shrinkage of the Church property escheated by the government would itself unfold a tale of official rapacity. Even the bench has not been free from charges of blind partisanship continued to the present hour, with here and there ugly hints of corruption. Most of the Federal officials in Utah have been men of unimpeachable integrity and of rare personal courage in dealing with one of the most pernicious institutions of modern times; but unfortunately there were some who took advantage of a righteous cause to advance their personal interests. Curiously enough some of these political vultures during the late campaign appealed, upon the ground of past sympathy and protection, to the very people whom they despoiled.

Polygamy among the Mormons had all the tenacity of a sacred institution. It was taught as a divine command, "a necessity to man's highest exaltation in the life to come." For more than a quarter of a century, the Mormon Church fought, with every weapon that it could command, the laws directed against its favorite institution. One by one, new and more rigorous penalties were enacted by Congress against polygamy. Finding women the most ardent champions of the vicious practice (owing to their stronger religious convictions) Congress, in 1887, took away their right of suffrage. The right of dower was restored, in order that the first wife might always be able to protect herself through her property rights. Federal machinery for the enforcement of penal acts was steadily increased and strengthened. Deputy marshals watched, pursued, and arrested men suspected of polygamy with the same zeal that Southern officers pursued fugitive slaves before the war. Indeed, the similarity of the two callings led to the application of the term "underground" to those offenders hiding from the law. Friends kept the refugees informed of the movements of the officers. The news of a deputy's approach outsped the officer himself. One Mormon who was captured and sentenced to a term in the penitentiary after successfully evading the law's penalties for years, told me that he had outwitted the deputies dozens of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

times through the warning of religious brethren. Often he had lain on the summit of a neighboring mountain and laughed in his sleeve as he watched his pursuers searching house after house in the village below in hope of finding him. He was finally surprised and taken through the treachery of a sister of a "plural" wife. On one occasion I was hospitably entertained on the frontier by a ranchman who cooked me an appetizing dinner with his own hands. He gave me to understand that he was a bachelor. I afterward accidentally discovered that he was a Mormon dignitary and had five wives. His first wife he did not like, and he dared not live openly with any of the others; so he pretended to be a bachelor, and he made stealthy visits to his favorite spouses at such times as he could best avoid the observation of the United States officers. President Woodruff of the Mormon Church was for some time himself "on the underground." Being a man of active temperament, he chafed under confinement. At one "station" he made it a practice to go out by moonlight and with a hand-sickle spend most of the night cutting grain, commencing in the centre of the field and working outward. In this manner he cut and bound a large field of wheat, until there was left standing only a fringe of grain on the outside which he dared not mow for fear of discovery.

By reason of the secrecy attaching to the marriage rite in the Mormon Church it was seldom possible to prove "plural" marriage. Nearly all the indictments had to be on the count of "unlawful cohabitation." Those convicted for this offence were commonly regarded as polygamists, and so considered in estimating the extent of the practice.

While able to evade the laws to a certain extent, the Mormons could not stem the tide of indignation which rose steadily against them. In the spring of 1890 a bill taking away the elective franchise from all Mormons was favorably reported in both Houses of Congress; and in July a bill was reported to the Senate providing for the appointment of all county officers in Utah by the Governor instead of their election by the people. The passage of one of the bills, or of both, was imminent. Idaho had already been admitted into the Union with a constitutional proviso disfranchising believers in the Mormon creed. Meanwhile within the Mormon Church a sentiment had gradually been growing against polygamy. Contact with the great numbers of Gentiles pouring into the Territory, strong enough by this time to carry the elections in both Salt Lake City and Ogden, made

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many of the younger Mormons ashamed of their peculiar institution. Many children of "plural" wives, moved by sympathy for their mothers, were at heart embittered against the practice. Mormon influence in politics and business was directed against the young men and in favor of the older, even as it favored the Mormons at the expense of the Gentiles. The result was internal dissension and incipient rebellion against Church authority. More than this, there were many members of the Church who had no serious religious conviction, but remained within its pale for social or commercial reasons.

The Church authorities, under these circumstances, had a very difficult task laid on them. They did not longer dare to countenance polygamy in the face of the culminating wrath of the Nation and the opposition from within the Church. Neither did they dare directly to repudiate their old teaching by declaring "plural" marriage wrong in principle. The only practical line of retreat was the one adopted, whereby the President of the Church publicly "advised Latter-Day Saints against contracting any marriage forbidden by the law of the land." Nominally and theoretically, "plural" or "celestial" marriage remains a part of the Mormon creed, though its practice was suspended for all time. Those who argue that, because the suspension did not come in the form of a revelation, it must therefore have been but an artful subterfuge having in view the future revival of polygamy, fail to do justice to the President of the Church or to understand the embarrassing position in which he was placed before his people.

That the Mormons were sincere, both in renouncing polygamy and disbanding their political party, no one conversant with the affairs of Utah during the past four years can for a moment doubt. Their acts have confirmed their professions. The Liberals, or non-Mormons, by disbanding their political party and declaring for Statehood a year ago, emphasized their belief in the sincerity of their former opponents. The institution of polygamy would have gone down eventually of its own weight under the rush of Gentile immigration. The action of the Church only hastened the inevitable. In the days of its strongest hold less than ten per cent of the adult males of the Territory lived in polygamy. No "plural" marriages in any form are now taking place in Utah. It is a sin within the Mormon Church as within any other to live with more than one woman. The young man who should attempt it would find himself and his mistress (for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such any "plural" wife would be regarded) subject to the same social ostracism from the Mormons as from society at large.

There is, however, another phase of this interesting question. With the division of the Mormons on National party-lines, the renunciation of their obnoxious creed and the inauguration of "the era of good feeling" in Utah, there has been a complete cessation of prosecutions for polygamy; and numbers of old-time offenders have resumed relations with their "plural" wives, with practical immunity from punishment. But the prop of polygamy, its social respectability and exaltation as a religious virtue, has been taken away. These old polygamists visit their younger wives precisely as a married man in an Eastern community might consort with a mistress—quietly and stealthily, not openly or boastfully as formerly. Their conduct is under the ban of the Church, and, since it is no longer justified by a religious principle, is regarded simply as an affair of lust or of affection for former associations too strong to withstand. We find a close analogy to this condition of things in the prohibition States where, in spite of stringent laws, the old toper undergoes any humiliation to secure his favorite beverage. Human nature does not differ greatly in New York, Massachusetts, Kansas, or Utah. But, with the passing away of the present generation, the last vestige of polygamy will disappear. No edict of the Church could restore it. Aside from the reasons already given, an insurmountable barrier in the way of its resumption is arising in the social amalgamation of Gentiles and Mormons. Intermarriages between the two classes have rapidly increased under the new conditions. Within a decade, the distinguishing characteristics of Mormonism will be no stronger in Utah than the distinguishing characteristics of Catholicism, Presbyterianism, or Methodism.

A strong evidence of the sincerity of the Mormon people and their devotion to principle was revealed in the recent political campaign. Many of the professional politicians who formerly inveighed most bitterly against the Mormons then protested with equal vehemence their former love and devotion. Having for years assailed Church influence in the State, these men recently appealed to religious prejudice in the hope of personal preferment. The following quotation from a political catechism that was scattered broadcast throughout the Territory, will illustrate the methods whereby it was sought to win the Mormon vote:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Who inaugurated the scheme to confiscate the property of the Mormon Church and to disfranchise the women of Utah? The Republican Party.

Who attempted to disfranchise the Mormon people? The Republican Party.

Who for thirty years refused Statehood to Utah? The Republican Party.

Who refused to give a majority of Utah's people a full representation in its National convention? The Republican Party.

Who brought about the return of the Church property? The Democratic Party.

Who obtained Statehood for Utah? The Democratic Party.

Who enfranchised all the Mormon people? Cleveland.

But appeals to religious prejudice during the recent campaign awakened only Mormon resentment and indignation. If ecclesiastics attempted to mount the hustings, they were compelled to take the same sort of knocks that laymen receive. No sort of religious interference was tolerated. Having been liberated from the religious yoke in political matters, the masses seem to have plunged into the opposite extreme of an independent delirium. Political contention ran wildest in the rural localities where the population is almost exclusively Mormon. Personal hostility waxed so warm that the President of the Mormon Church recently felt called upon to warn his followers against personal abuse in politics. Indeed, the recent campaign afforded a strange and unique spectacle. We saw a large body of our own citizens—Americans by birth or by long residence —undergoing political education in their maturity instead of in their youth. At the time the People's, or Church, party disbanded, the inhabitants of China could scarcely have been more ignorant of the principles of the two great political parties of the United States than were the masses of the people of Utah. The eagerness and absorbing seriousness with which they went to work to study the principles of government is one of the most hopeful signs of new Utah. To whichever of the national parties the Mormon voter gave his allegiance, he gave it with all the earnestness and enthusiasm of the new convert.

The best evidence of the remarkable change which has recently taken place in Utah is afforded by the growth of the public-school system. Five years ago there were practically only sectarian schools in the Territory. On the one side were the so-called public schools, where tuition fees were required, controlled, dominated and almost exclusively patronized by the Mormon people. The school-houses were cheap, primitive buildings, devoid of any modern conveniences and of many of the actual requisites of health. On the other side were the denominational schools, established by non-Mormon churches, and maintained chiefly by funds from missionary societies in the East-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ern States. There was no pretence of system in the educational work. At best it was a mere makeshift. In Salt Lake City within half a decade there has sprung from these heterogeneous elements a public-school system which is thought to be one of the best in the country. The school-houses are commodious buildings, constructed with an understanding of school architecture. Both tuition and text-books are free. Of a total school population of 11,941 children, 88 per cent are in daily attendance upon the public schools, as compared with 27 per cent in 1889. In the country districts the advance has not been so rapid, but sectarianism is being rapidly eliminated from educational work, and a better class of buildings and teachers is provided. In the schools, too, as elsewhere, the distinction between Mormon and Gentile has been almost entirely obliterated.

The business influence of the Mormon authorities upon their people had become lax long before their political influence was weakened. Years ago the faithful were warned not to patronize Gentile stores, and later they were warned not to sell land to the Gentiles. But these warnings are now matters of ancient history in Utah, and with one accord all citizens, irrespective of creed, are working together to build up the Territory. A "home industry" movement has assumed gigantic proportions and has already made itself felt in a flattering material advance. In examining the *personnel* of recent incorporations I have observed that among the organizers of almost every stock-company are members of both religious elements. In Salt Lake City the line of demarcation on Main Street between Gentile and Mormon stores has been obliterated. Mormons and Gentiles trade indiscriminately at each other's places of business. Mormon merchants seek no longer the shadow of the Temple. All over the city the historic landmarks are fast vanishing. The long adobe houses with their various apartments for the different wives, the high fences of boulders and mortar, the all-seeing eye above the entrances to stores, the old wall that surrounded the city,—all these have already yielded to modern taste and improvement. More significant, however, than these material changes is the revolution that has taken place in the social customs, the business habits, the political opinions and the religious practices of the people. Utah is rapidly losing those strange features of life which made her an object of such fascinating interest to students and tourists; but to compensate for this loss she has placed herself in complete harmony with American thought and American institutions.

GLEN MILLER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW STORY-TELLERS AND THE DOOM OF REALISM.

EIGHT years ago, in writing on "Realism in Literature," I called attention to the then recently printed essays of M. Emile de Vogüé. That excellent critic, who has since been admitted to the French Academy, had in the essays referred to pointed out indications that realistic fiction—at least in France—was fast nearing the high-water mark, and he confidently expected that the turn in the tide would be followed by fiction of a purer, different sort. Only eight years have elapsed, yet no one can doubt that, so far as Realism is concerned, M. de Vogüé was a far-seeing observer. M. Zola, the arch-priest of the obscene rites of French Realism, has ceased to have any formative influence on French novelists; he has ceased to be called "*maître*," or to be imitated by disciples; his own books are still widely read, for obvious reasons, among which his talent as an advertiser is not the least; but they beget no warfare among critics and their power as literary epoch-makers has vanished. Even the stories of Guy de Maupassant, the Realist who presented his delicately-wrought immoralities to you with silver tongs, instead of Zola's coal-shovel, we were told the other day by another watcher of French literature, have lost their vogue: and yet Maupassant is but two years dead.

I refer first to France because France is still the initiator of novelties, whether in politics, literature, or millinery; and when she does not originate she is usually the first to give world-currency to what others have initiated. But the symptoms observed in France have been widespread, and the change they betoken is working most healthily in England and America. We violate no confidences in declaring that Realism in fiction is passing away. Eight years ago the "Realists"—who ought rather to be called the "Epidermists"—had the cry; to-day you have only to look at the publishers' announcements, or at the volumes in everybody's hand, to see what fiction is popular. Caine, Doyle, Zangwill, Weyman, Crockett, Du Maurier,—not Realists but Romanticists, not analysts but story-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tellers,—are writing the novels which the multitude are sitting up late to read. And Stevenson and Crawford, whose reputation dates from the very heyday of Realism, have certainly not lost popularity during the past decade, while—worse and worse!—two separate popular editions of Scott, and new translations of Dumas *père*, have just come out, in spite of the assertions of the Epidermists that not even schoolboys could now be coaxed to read Sir Walter. Above all, Rudyard Kipling, who was so recently characterized by Mr. Howells as merely a young man with his hat cocked over one eye, holds the entire English-speaking world in fee as no other story-teller since Dickens has held it.

Now this change deserves attention, even from those of us who read very little current fiction, but who realize how important a symptom is the popular demand for it. To follow the statistics of the circulation of novels may lead to conclusions not less significant than do the statistics of the annual consumption of malt and fermented liquors. If you found, for instance, that the nation had in the course of ten years given up whiskey and taken to beer, you might be able to demonstrate the close relation between strong drink and crime; and so we may be sure that the change in taste which has led the public back to romantic fiction has for its basis something deeper than caprice. It is too soon to say how deep the meaning really is, or what may come of it, but it is not too soon to look back over the losing fight of Realism and to specify some of its traits.

In the first place, the tide turned much earlier than most of us expected. Ten years ago few of us dared hope that the exposure of Zola's plausible fallacy would so soon be generally agreed to. He had been captivated by the eminent physiologist, Claude Bernard, who found medicine an art and left it a science, and, reasoning from analogy, he had concluded that fiction might be subjected to a similar evolution. Observation and experiment, these were the two methods by which the "experimental novelist," subsequently miscalled "Realist," should produce his work. We all know with what vigor and plausibility Zola set forth this doctrine, which had all the more attractiveness in that it seemed to tally with the scientific spirit of the age. Everything was tinctured with science; the very word "scientific" had become a shibboleth: we had "scientific" clothespins, "scientific" liverpads,—why not "scientific" novels?

And in due time "scientific" novels came,—"Nana," "L'Assommoir," and the rest; but I suspect that Zola's literary philosophy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would have achieved notoriety much more slowly had he not chosen topics either brutally obscene or horrible, which at once excited the jaded Parisian palate. And as the author of these works proclaimed that he was personally as impartial towards virtue and vice as a chemist is towards acids and alkalies, and that he did not make it his business to correct nature, but simply to photograph her, his aim being scientific truth, many persons read his abominations who could not have been induced to do so but for the seductive catchword "scientific." Many others read, and still read, Zola, regardless of any literary theory, to gratify their pornographic appetite; for it required no keenness to perceive that decency, modesty, sanctity,—conceptions which, after many painful centuries, the more civilized minority of the human race has begun to venerate,—could not protect themselves against the brazen presumptions of Realism. Zola and his fellows, at home and abroad, tore the veil away with an affectation of scientific impartiality even more repulsive than the downright prurience of the avowed worshippers of lubricity. Strenuously have they protested that their goddess is the naked Truth, but we may well ask, as we look at the product of their school, whether it has not been the nakedness rather than the divinity of Truth which has attracted them.

When Realism had thus assumed the proportion of a literary movement, the historians of literature went back to discover M. Zola's precursors. They traced, with what accuracy I know not, the roots of Realism down through Flaubert and Balzac to Stendhal. The disciples of the new school had no scruple in asserting that it was not only the school of the present and future, but that it would utterly supersede previous literature; its novels were to all previous novels as modern invention to old-fashioned handiwork. It would soon make even school-girls ashamed to admit that they enjoyed romances. Poetry, of course, could no more exist in its presence than frost before a blow-pipe. "There shall never be any more plots," was one of the edicts of the new law-givers. Not since the memorable conflict of the Romanticists and the Classicists had so pretentious a movement been seen; a movement, moreover, which affected, or tended to affect, not merely the writing of novels and all imaginative literature, but also our established views of morals.

I fear that we must confess that this Realistic movement has been, on the whole, less memorable than we should have predicted of a revolution which boldly took upon itself the task of creating a new

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heaven and a new earth. It has certainly been less spectacular, amusing, and attractive than the Romantic movement which culminated sixty-five years ago. Victor Hugo led that, as Zola has led this. Hugo was very human, and abounded in qualities which drew enthusiastic disciples round him. We cannot think of Zola as a man whom anybody can love; we think of him as a coldly calculating doctrinaire, a chemist who has invented a process for making top-dressing cheap and has the shrewdness to sell it at an enormous profit. In France, the quarrel has been rather *banal*, not enlivened by any such scenes as those which signalized the triumph of Hugo's supporters at the production of "Hernani."

In America, however, the warfare has not failed to amuse us, thanks to the wit of Mr. Howells. Yet even his wit has lacked the picturesqueness of Théophile Gautier's famous flaming waistcoat, which glows upon us from the records of the warfare of Romanticism. At the outset, however, Mr. Howells gave promise of being both picturesque and lively. We all remember how, after his first naïf declaration that the art of fiction as practised by Mr. Henry James and himself is a finer art than that of Dickens, Thackeray, and George Eliot, a burst of genial laughter swept over the continent and re-echoed even in England. Mr. Howells did not directly name himself, of course, but the implication was not to be escaped. The public laughed because it thought it had caught a man-of-the-world—one, moreover, who had been publishing books for a quarter of a century—in a perfectly indiscreet bit of egotism. The fact is, however, that Mr. Howells told the plain truth,—the art of fiction as practised by him and Mr. James is a finer art than that of Dickens or Thackeray, just as the art of the cameoist is "finer" than that of the sculptor.

Mr. Howells, being thoroughly in earnest, probably did not mind the laughter. At any rate no convert from one religion to another could be more zealous than he was during five or six years. He bore witness to his faith by example not less than by precept; and as he had the good fortune to be able to use as a mouthpiece a magazine with a very large circulation, he spread the gospel of Realism in a brief time before multitudes who are usually slow to feel the direction of literary currents. Whatever opinion readers might have had of the novel by Mr. Howells in the earlier part of the magazine, they were sure to be informed in a crisp, satirical essay farther on that only fools and old fogies tolerated fiction produced by other than Realistic methods.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A propagandist as witty, resourceful, and assured as he, has not for so many years together and from so conspicuous a pulpit preached any literary gospel, good or bad, in America; and there were many of us who, while we read very little of his novels, never missed one of his monthly essays. They were significant, if only as symptoms; and then, perhaps the doctrine they uttered might be true. At any rate, it was very wholesome, if somewhat bewildering, at the start, to have our venerable idols challenged, and to receive from the lips of an evangelist the message which was to revolutionize literature, casting out its false gods, dethroning its arrogant sovereigns, levelling its exclusive aristocracies, and establishing a Simon-pure democracy which should be run forever on scientific principles. It took fortitude, until custom made us callous, to watch Mr. Howells, like another Tarquin, go up and down the poppy-field of literature, lopping off head after head which had brought delight to millions. The Greeks, of course, were smitten very early: they are always the first to excite the righteous rage of all sorts of reformers, and have been demolished so many times! Artistic principles—symmetry, grace, condensation, beauty—went next: Realism, we perceived, knew not beauty, and despised literary neatness as your true son of the soil is supposed to despise those who indulge in soap and water. Poetry, too, had its death-warrant signed. Even Shakespeare was not spared. At his martyrdom, we knew that genius too must go, and soon the dictum came that "there is no such thing as genius," that what the unscientific foreworld called by that name is only a strong congenital predisposition *plus* indefatigable perseverance.

Incidentally we learned the tenets of Realism, and month by month we were introduced to Spanish and Russian masters of the new creed. A little later than some of us, but earlier than the masses, Mr. Howells discovered Tolstoi, and then we knew why the Greeks and art and Shakespeare had been previously swept away. For the great Russian, though he be in many aspects a master, has certainly no inkling of the Greek conception of art, no spark of Shakespeare's dramatic intensity. The Greek made his effects by selection, Tolstoi makes his by cumulation; the Greek's motto was, "Nothing superfluous"; Tolstoi's is, "Put in everything, and then add a little more." If you think of Russia as a vast flat prairie land, in which even a tree or hillock is an important feature, you may be reminded of Tolstoi; if you remember Greece, with its infinite variety of chiselled mountains and valleys, its individual headlands, its islands

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and lovely bays, with a luminous sky above and beautiful color on all below, you have, in contrast with him, the Greek. No Greek could so have sinned against his instinct for symmetry as to write "War and Peace," a story, or congeries of stories, stretching through twenty-five hundred pages—the equivalent in space of fifty "Antigones" and of seven or eight Iliads. The Iliad is getting well on in years, and yet, if there existed a company for insuring the lives of literary works, some of us think that the Iliad would prove a better risk than "War and Peace": for one good reason, it is only one eighth as bulky as the Russian masterpiece; and bulk is an element which will count more and more in the longevity of books.

I pause at Tolstoi, because Mr. Howells assured us that his works not only form the culminating glory of Realism, but practically render obsolete all other works not produced by that system. So we accepted the reign of Czar Lyoff, although for a while, after the immolation of Shakespeare and the great companions of our youth, the world seemed empty, lonesome. It was as if the sun had been stolen, and the thief had hung up a locomotive headlight in its stead. But, on closer examination of Tolstoi, we were surprised to find that he wrote almost always with a strong moral purpose; and this, we had been so often assured, was one of the foul practices of the old school of novelists which Realism would abolish. For, to the genuine Realist, virtue and vice are what acids and alkalies are to the chemist: therefore, he cannot prefer, cannot have, an ethical purpose.

Reading Mr. Howells's preachments month by month, while we could but admire his versatility in iconoclasm, and his unquestioning zeal,—he swallowed Tolstoi's "Kreutzer Sonata" and Zola's "La Terre," and smacked his lips, bidding us all do likewise,—we saw that we had to do with a very clever disciple and not at all with a master. As certainly as Mr. Howells is a more graceful and clever writer than M. Zola, so certainly is M. Zola profounder and more philosophical than Mr. Howells. The Frenchman had, indeed, thought out and formulated his system, and his essays in "Le roman expérimental" remain the chief document of the theory of Realism. Them, the serious student of literary and spiritual movements may consult, but Mr. Howells's critical writings take on more and more the aspect of being merely the register of the vagaries of a mind alert rather than cultured, and of a generous spirit which cannot resist becoming the champion of crude causes. Not impossibly, therefore, these writings of his will be valued less and less as orthodox Realistic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tracts, and more and more as data for studying the psychological development of an interesting personality.

Nevertheless, Mr. Howells had the satisfaction, for the time being, of making Realism the chief topic of discussion, and of encouraging the belief in innumerable crude minds that you have only to report word for word the morning gossip of idle women on a summer hotel piazza, or the rusticities in wit and grammar of the patrons of the corner grocery, in order to produce a work beside which Shakespeare's pages look faded. Perhaps no higher compliment can be paid to Mr. Howells than to state that those who undertake to write about Realism in America will inevitably find themselves dealing with it as though it were his private property, instead of with the doctrines and assertions of a system. And yet for a dozen years a horde of Realists, great and small, have been filling the magazines with their products and turning out an average of two novels a day.

And now Realism—a movement which, but for the deep matters it involves, we might call a fad—is on the wane. It has been the logical outcome of our age, whose characteristic is analysis. Our modern science, abandoning the search for the Absolute, has been scrutinizing every atom, to weigh and name it, and to discover its relations with its neighbors. "Relativity" has been the watchword. Science literally knows neither great nor small: it examines the microbe and Sirius with equal interest; it draws no distinction between beauty and ugliness—having no preference for the toadstool or the rose, the sculpin or the trout: it is impartial; it seeks only to know. By observation and experiment, by advancing from the known to the unknown, science has begun to make the first accurate inventory of the substances, laws, and properties of the world of matter. Its achievements have already been stupendous. Its methods have dominated all the other works in our time; it was inevitable that they should encroach on the sphere of art and of literature.

Arguing from analogy, the Realist persuaded himself that the only means for attaining perfect accuracy in fiction must be experiment and observation, which had brought such rich returns to Science. He disdained anything except an exact reproduction of real life—hence his name, Realist. To him, as to the man of science, there should be, he declared, neither beauty nor ugliness, great nor small, goodness nor evil; he was impartial; he eliminated the personal equation; he would make his mind as unprejudiced as a photographic plate. To Pyrrhonism so thoroughgoing, considerations of interest

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and charm appealed no more than did considerations of morals or of beauty. The Realist frankly announced that the precise record of the humblest mind was just as important as one of Shakespeare's mind would be. So we have been regaled by our English and American Realists with interminable inspection and introspection of commonplace intellects; and if we have yawned, we have been told that we were still poisoned with Romanticism, and still had a childish desire to read about persons with high titles, moving in the upper circles. Realism, we were assured, was the application of democratic principles to fiction. When, on the other hand, the foreign Realists dealt chiefly in moral filth, we were chidden for our squeamishness, and informed that, since depravity exists, the Realist is in duty bound to make impartial studies of it.

I need not point out that such doctrines reduce literature, art, and morals to anarchy. The "scientific method," applied in this way, is not the method for portraying human nature. Only the human can understand, and consequently interpret, the human: how, therefore, shall a man who boasts that he has *dehumanized* himself so that his mind is as impartial as a photographic plate, enabling him to look on his fellow-beings without preferring the good to the bad, the beautiful to the ugly,—how shall he be qualified to speak for the race which does discriminate, does prefer, does feel? The camera sees only the outside; the Realist sees no more, and so it would be more appropriate to call him "Epidermist," one who investigates only the surface, the cuticle of life,—usually with a preference for very dirty skin.

And, in truth, he deceives himself as to the extent of his scientific impartiality. He, too, has to select; he cannot set down every trivial thought, cannot measure every freckle. His work is fiction—a consideration which he had forgotten. But since he is forced to select, he cannot escape being judged by the same canons as all other artists. Do they not all aim at representing life? Is *Silas Lapham*, produced by Epidermist methods, more real than *Shylock* or *Hamlet?* Will he be thought so three hundred years hence, or will he seem odd and antiquated, a mere fashion, like the cut of old garments? Only the human can understand and interpret the human; and our Epidermists also will, in time, perceive that not by relying on the phonograph and kodak can they come to know the heart of man. They have mistaken the dead actual for reality, the show of the moment for the essence, the letter for the spirit.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

By the imagination have all the highest creations of art and literature been produced, and the general truths of science and morals been discovered: for the imagination is that supreme faculty in man which beholds reality; it is the faculty, furthermore, which synthetizes, which vivifies, which constructs. The Epidermist, whose forte is analysis, discarding the imagination, has hoped by accumulating masses of details to produce as sure an effect of reality, as genius produces by using a few essentials. Yet, merely in the matter of illusion, this is an inferior method: if Mr. Kipling, for instance, can in a paragraph illude his readers to the extent he desires, whereas it takes Mr. Howells or Mr. James ten pages to produce an illusion, the chances are ten to one against Epidermism as a means of literary expression.

That heaping up of minute details which is proper in scientific investigation has influenced immensely all our intellectual processes for the past fifty years. There was a time when theology was the absorbing interest, and even non-theological works of that time, the fiction and poetry, are inevitably saturated with theology. We can detect it plainly and can pronounce it just so far a detriment to the novel or poem in which we find it. So science has permeated our time, encroaching upon, and inevitably vitiating, departments over which it has no jurisdiction. The multitude has been willing to accept the products of Epidermism, because its own imagination has been dulled, and it has come to suppose that observation and experiment were the only methods by which truth can be discovered. Hence the tanks of *real* water and the *real* burglars and the *real* fire-engines in our recent plays, and hence the predominance of Realism in fiction.

But the knell of the Epidermists has sounded. The novels that are everywhere in demand are the novels with a story. Individually, they may be good or bad—it matters not: the significant fact is that the public taste has turned, and that that instinct which is as old as the children of Adam and Eve, the instinct for a story, has reasserted itself.

Realism, therefore, has been a phase, indicating the decadence of fiction, and not, as the Epidermists themselves believed, its regeneration. It represents the period during which fiction has been enslaved by scientific methods, a period when the imagination has lain dormant, and other—lower—faculties have essayed to do her work. The novels produced by Realism will not, I suppose, occupy the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attention of the world sixty years from now to the same extent that the products of Romanticism still occupy our attention. Certainly, the polemics of Realism have produced nothing so striking as Hugo's and Manzoni's and Heine's essays on Romanticism; nothing that has the lasting quality of Wordsworth's prefaces, or of Coleridge's criticism on Wordsworth. I hazard the prediction that our children, if they ever turn the pages of the masterpieces of Realism, will wonder how we could once have read them: and that, not because they will find in those pages much that is nasty (under the plea of "science"), and much that is morbid, and more that is petty, but because the prevailing note is dulness. Against dulness, the gods themselves have no refuge save flight.

Eight years ago all this was less evident than it is now. We could not say with assurance eight years ago that the movement had reached its logical culmination. To-day we can say this. Doubtless its votaries will not abandon it suddenly; but when they find the story-tellers getting all the readers, they will know their doom. Epidermism has already found its true habitat in the sensational daily press: there, the kodak and the phonograph and the eavesdropper have untrammelled play; and moreover, the persons portrayed are really alive—which gives them an advantage against which the make-believe real people of Mr. Howells cannot in the long run compete; for if *realness* be the final test, the really real heroes of the newspapers must excel the make-believe real characters of Epidermist fiction. What chance has *Silas Lapham* with the barber or bootblacks described, with illustrations, any day in the New York "Scavenger"? Another product of Epidermism, the dialect story, will soon, we may hope, be banished from the magazines to the transactions of the dialect societies, which have been providentially springing up. Of the shameless products—the obscenities and filth—we can at least predict that the time for foisting them, and all other matters not pertinent to fiction, upon us, under the plea of scientific impartiality, has passed; though doubtless from time to time some angel of the pit, some new Zola, will come to stir the surface of the cesspools of society.

Realism, or Epidermism, passes; but at least the example of sincerity which many of its devotees have given will not be lost. And now, as the atmosphere is clearing, the dear and venerable masters greet us in their majesty undiminished. Shakespeare—whose laurel has been prematurely claimed so many times by ardent partisans for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the brows of ephemeral idols—Shakespeare and Dante, and the spokesmen of antiquity, confer serenely together. Near them, in another group, are Scott and Hawthorne and Thackeray, unconscious that they were so recently ostracized from Olympus. Could their words reach us, assuredly they would confirm the message written through all their books: "The lamp of Art differs from the lamp of Science; confound not their uses. Think not by machine or tool, which is material, to discover the secret of the heart of man, who is spiritual. The Real includes the Ideal; but the Real without the Ideal is as the body without life, a thing for anatomists to dissect. Only the human can understand and interpret the human."

WILLIAM R. THAYER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS AS SEEN BY A BRAHMAN.

MUCH criticism, adverse as well as favorable, has been published about Mr. Gandhi's article in THE FORUM for April, on "Why Christian Missions Have Failed in India." Prominent among the critics is Mr. Fred. Perry Powers, whose reply appeared in THE FORUM for June. Mr. Gandhi says that Christian missions in India have failed. Mr. Powers speaks of "The Success of Christian Missions in India." I must take the side of Mr. Powers and say that the business of the missionaries has succeeded.

How can an enterprise fail which is maintained by religion and supported by millions of good people who pay their money to continue it? Every year $14,588,354 are added to the capital invested in missions, according to Mr. Powers's statement. Hence there is no fear of the failure of missions until this vast amount is withheld by the Americans. The missionary gets good pay and lives better than an average well-to-do American gentleman. The friends of the missionary say: "Oh! the poor missionary! He receives only $100 to $200 a month!" This is a very small sum in America compared with its value in India; for a man who earns $100 a month in India can live as well as a man who has $1,000 a month in America. He can have five or six servants, a good house, free of cost to him, and a horse and carriage—at a cost of less than $100 per month. The missionary lives exceedingly well. He has no cares except the making of his reports and statements of the converts that he makes. In the morning he takes his breakfast; he walks in the church grounds, and looks to his flower-garden; then he sits in an arm-chair on the veranda, reading the Bible, newspapers, or a book; he eats a hearty luncheon and takes a good nap, the servant pulling the fan; he gets up at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, takes his Bible and goes to the town, followed by a pariah convert. He stands at the corner of a street, fixes his eye-glasses, and makes a sign for his pariah disciple to begin the work. The pariah, clad in American garments, excepting his head-dress, stands and exhorts his countrymen to embrace Christianity. While the Christian pariah goes on with his harangue,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the missionary looks with a smile of pride, first on the pariah and then on the people. When the Christian pariah exhausts his fund of exhortation and ends his oration, the missionary adds a few words. The better class of people look at him with pitying eyes, smile, and walk off to their homes. By this time it is the hour for dinner, and the missionary goes home. The talk and the walk give him an appetite for the good dinner that awaits him. After dinner he enjoys music or a chat with his wife, and then he retires, to get up in the morning to repeat the arduous business of the day previous. So the missionaries have not failed, and will not fail so long as Christians have money to waste in this useless way.

Let us now see to what extent the Christian missionaries have succeeded in converting the heathen of India. The missionaries first went with great zeal and a noble aim, and with sanguine hopes of converting the masses by wholesale. In their imaginations they regarded the Hindus as benighted, without any religion worthy of the name; and it did not occur to them that the hold which the Hindu's religion has on him and his whole life is a great deal stronger and more firmly rooted, because it is a great deal older and more elaborate, than the hold that the Christian religion has on Christians. This is the fundamental mistake made by missionaries, and the fundamental delusion held by the masses of Christians who contribute to the support of missions. They see in their dreams millions of Hindus, especially the Brahmans, coming to the church and kneeling to be baptized—welcoming the new religion. But when the missionaries reach India, these dreams dissolve and they meet a wholly different state of things. The higher classes of the Hindus are the proudest religious devotees found among men. They hold with greater firmness to their ancient religion and its literature than to life itself. For all other religions, indeed, but especially for the Christian religion, which is associated in their minds with the practice of meat-eating nd wine-drinking, they have (to be frank) a profound and immovable ontempt. The higher classes, particularly the Brahmans, have a religion of their own antedating the time set in the old Christian chronology when Adam and Eve were created; and its grand philosophy is studied the world over. Moreover the Brahman feels his immeasurable intellectual superiority to the Christian—indeed to any other man. In India, the routine of every-day life—food, clothing, customs, and manners—is all part and parcel of the religion. Dressing and eating and bathing—every act of life is a religious act.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Moreover, in the present Hindu religion one can find all the essential elements of all other religions. It is a vast pile of religions built up with the strongest spiritual cement, which has stood for thousands of years, challenging the storms of Buddhism, Mohammedanism, and now Christianity. Now and then faulty bricks in the structure, such as pariahs and other low classes, are "converted"; but this conversion, instead of weakening the old religion, polishes it, and takes away the dirt from it. It has stood innumerable attacks, as scholars who have made a study of Hindu religion know. The Hindus regard it as impregnable and everlasting. To preach Christianity to the Hindu, who had a religion and was civilized before the dawn of history, seems to him, therefore, the most ridiculous thing on earth —indeed, audacious.

All Christian missionaries to India must have met with this kind of a disillusion—at one period or another—if they have good judgment and any great degree of common sense.

When, therefore, it was found to be practically impossible to make great numbers of converts among the higher classes,—the Brahmans,—they naturally turned their attention to the lower classes, the lowest of which is the pariahs. The pariahs, the very touch of whom is polluting to a Brahman, are not allowed to live in the same streets with the higher-caste Hindu. They live outside the town. The missionary gave them food and clothing, and thus won their gratitude. He reminded them how low they were in Hindu society, and told them that if they became Christians they would raise themselves from their low station. Naturally some of the pariahs, more to get a status in life than on account of religion, for which they care very little, became Christians.

Here, in justice to the missionary, I must say that he has done much to lift the pariah, socially and mentally, by opening schools and educating those who became converts. The structure of Hindu society and religion—built on caste—is such that there is no such help for the pariah as the Christian missionary has brought to him.

When they opened these schools, Brahman boys also attended, and do to the present day, and a few Brahman boys have been converted to Christianity, not by convincing them of the superiority of the Christian religion, but by initiating them into meat-eating and wine-drinking. In one case—of a boy of sixteen—the first step was to give him sweet wine, which was very palatable to him. The first

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

day's glass made him pleasant; the next day's made him more pleasant; and the third day's gave the boy a strong taste for it. He was in ecstasy. But all this while his parents were kept in utter ignorance of his experience, for the Brahman is absolutely forbidden to taste wine; they thought that he was simply studying English, and after completing his studies they hoped that he would be able to support them in their old age. After a time the boy became attached to the missionary, who had a magical influence over his young heart, and he was persuaded to become a Christian. The boy did not yet know much about his own religion, so that he could not compare it with Christianity, of which he had heard a great deal. Hence he was an easy victim—to the great agony and grief of his parents. The boy ran away from home on a certain day, and went to a Christian church. The parents got information of him and went with tears to the missionary and implored him to give the boy back to them. The boy was married; his young wife would become a widow if he became a Christian. She could not live with him, and nobody, not even his father or mother, could eat with him, because he had lost caste. He could not enter the house of a Hindu, because he was polluted. All his mother's future hopes for him were dashed to pieces on the Christian rock. The missionary did not yield to the tears of the parents. He took a piece of meat, and put it into the mouth of the boy in their presence and in the presence of the people assembled, and gave him a glass of wine to drink. It would be hard to imagine the sorrow of the parents, the father-in-law, the mother-in-law, and the young wife, to all of whom he now became morally and practically dead, because by his conversion he lost caste and brought disgrace to both the families. This case was the talk of everybody in the surrounding town, and it is painful for me to think and write about it. I knew this family personally. It was wrecked. The old father, who was a revenue officer and the magistrate of the county, died of a broken heart within six months, and the mother followed him within a short period. The young man's wife dragged out her life some years in sorrow, and when she found that there was no other alternative she went to her husband, but did not accept his religion; and she died an untimely death. This is not a solitary instance.

In this way the missionaries have made a very few converts among the higher classes. For a time, in consequence, the better classes of people suspected the missionary schools and withdrew their children from them, so that the missionaries, by attacking the prejudice of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hindus and interfering in their family relations one with another, as in the above case, have at times been the means of arresting and preventing normal progress in practical things in India, which the introducing of Western education and material civilization, without the Christian religion, would further.

The missionaries, then, make converts of the lowest classes by giving them bread and promising them money or employment. Many of the missionaries to India, perhaps, never find out the real feelings of the Hindus: they are too ignorant. At any rate, out of ignorance and out of other defects a vast literature of misinformation has been spread in Christian countries about the Hindus and their religion. There are those who think that the missionaries take care to keep their own countrymen ignorant of the good side of the Hindus. Such misinformation has been spread, for instance, about the car of Juggernaut; the throwing of babies into the Ganges to be eaten by crocodiles; and the suttee or the burning of widows! The current stories about the Juggernaut and the throwing of little children into the Ganges have not a particle of truth; and with regard to the suttee, this was practised only among the warriors in certain parts of India, and not among the Brahmans and other classes. As to the car of Juggernaut, a few words describing this religious ceremony will not be out of place.

One of the religious festivals among the Hindus consists of the exhibition, on an appointed day, of the symbol of the Deity, which is mounted on a car elaborately decorated and drawn through the streets near the temple, followed by a procession with music and chanting. This religious festival in many respects is like certain festivals of the Christian church in many parts of Europe, where, preceded by the cross, the priests and people march to the cathedral to do special honor to certain so-called relics which, by the ignorant, are supposed to possess miraculous powers. The car bears the image of the Deity and is called by different names in different provinces; and in Orissa, Bengal, the name given is Jagannatha, signifying "the God of the Universe." Since coming to America I have heard many startling stories about people throwing themselves under this car and being crushed to death. I have seen such festivals many times, but have never seen or heard of any such thing happening. When the car, which is very high, is drawn through the streets, a man may have been accidentally forced under it by the crowd; or, perhaps, in a religious frenzy, some fanatic may have thrown himself

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under it, but if such a thing ever happened it was but the result of most ignorant religious fanaticism.

Mr. Powers says that the missionaries have done much for Hindu literature. To translate the Bible into the vernacular, which they murder outright; to print Solomon's proverbs; to publish small pamphlets saying that the Hindus are immoral, that their religion lacks moral precepts, and that every religion is bad except Christianity; and to put forth all sorts of books ridiculing the Hindu and praising Christians,—if this be improving Hindu literature, they have done more than enough. Unfortunately the missionaries are spoiling the language instead of improving it; for their translations are written without regard to Hindu grammar and are difficult for the Hindu to understand. The "missionary" language is proverbial among educated Hindus.

A Sanskrit poet says that critics are like insects that enjoy only the rotten part and not the good. Mr. Powers has spoken of the immorality of the whole Eastern people for want of a good religion. He has confused India with China, Turkey, Japan, Africa, and other countries, although India differs from those nations as much as she does from America.

Let me draw a parallel, touching morality and religion, Christian and Hindu—in order to get a proper point of view and to point out the ease with which wrong conclusions in such matters are drawn. Take your own good Christian nation of the United States. What is the state of morality? Read your daily papers and note the number of murders, train robberies, bank robberies (by burglars at night, and by the managers by day), elopements, shootings, cuttings, divorce cases, suicides, not to mention lynchings, and the roasting of Negroes alive. Count the number of saloons. Every corner of a block is adorned by their illuminations. "Dens" of vice exist, not only in New York, but in all large cities of America, where the grossest immorality is practised. I have not seen them, but I have been well-informed by many frank Christian Americans about these places. Christians will say: "Oh, these are not Christians who do this, and you see our country is filled with foreigners and unbelievers; we are trying to put down vice, and we have missions for the purpose." I grant that there are foreigners here too, and unbelievers, but they are all Christians, and when the time comes for numbering the Christians, you add them; and when their morality is in question you discard them. So, to complete the parallel, if some bad men

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are found in India among the low classes, they are Hindus, and the whole Hindu society and religion are reviled by the Christians; but if even a greater number are found in the Christian countries, they are not Christians.

Moreover, as a Hindu reads Christian history, it is full of cruelties such as shock the Hindu mind and cause doubt of Christian morality. How has your own nation in the United States treated the Indians? You have almost extinguished them, as you have done the buffaloes. Who by force brought the African to your shores? What became of the aborigines of Australia? How was India conquered, and by whom? Who snatched the kingdom of Hawaii from the Queen of those Islands? Who were the Crusaders? Who burned people at the stake and invented torturing-machines? Who were those who wished to burn Galileo for expounding the theory of the earth's motion? Who acknowledged slavery and practised it for many centuries, until it was stopped with a great deal of bloodshed by the liberty-loving Americans, and then rather for economic than purely religious motives? Christian history is full of instances, and Christian nations are the most aggressive and most intolerant people. These facts have much to do with the Hindu prejudices against Christianity. They therefore think that Christianity has been the curse of the whole world, especially the Eastern nations. It is the Christians who go among them to kill, rob, and teach the people to drink. If this conclusion be unjust, it nevertheless shows the insuperable difficulty that the Christian missionaries meet.

As for personal morality—this has not been affected by religion pure and simple in any country. Human nature is everywhere the same. If the Christian says that the Hindu religion is bad because, for instance, of polygamy, then I say that the Christian religion is worse for the same or a similar or a worse reason.

Christian missionaries have carried to India fine reports of the Christians that they left at home; and they carry to Western nations the worst reports of the so-called heathen abroad. The Hindus, therefore, think that all Christians in the Western nations are good people, and the Americans think the Hindus are all bad. Alas! both are mistaken. I found this out after I came and saw the Christians at home.

We admire the Western civilization in its material points. Our people have begun to open their eyes to the wonderful progress the Western people have made in material civilization, in which they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have left us far behind. You enjoy life better than we do. We eat to live, and you live to eat. The railroads are bringing the different nationalities in India together, and under the British rule and the spread of English education the hard lines of caste are slowly passing away. We owe much to the Western civilization, and I am thankful to the British Government, which has done a great deal of good to our country. We now have good railroads, schools, printing-presses, newspapers, telegraph facilities, and other things, but not in proportion to the needs of our enormous population. Our lower classes, however, have not yet facilities for higher education. They are so poor that a man cannot spare even half a dollar a month for the school fees of his child. We want English free schools where no money is charged and where students are encouraged by scholarships. Americans can have no idea how poor the people of India are. They live in small huts and have no cot or bedding. Some of the lower classes cannot get a second meal a day, the first meal being a piece of bread or a little boiled rice.

Now if every dollar that the kind-hearted Americans spend on the missionaries were used in bringing up these lower classes by educating them, it would be the greatest charity in the world. Building more railroads, teaching mechanics, electricity, and all kinds of manufactures; making sanitary improvements in the villages and towns to prevent thousands of people from being swept away annually by cholera and other diseases which have made India their home, —for those the people of India would bless the Americans. In every poor man's house the praise of your nation would be sung, and the name "America" would be dear to them, and they would bless you from their hearts. If your object is truly to improve the condition of India's poor, then, instead of teaching them religion, send teachers and open schools; give them education and let them select any religion they like.

But it is a sheer waste of money to spend it on the missionaries. It does not help the people. On the contrary it only strengthens their own religious faith and creates international prejudice. The people bitterly complain against them for their interference, not only in religion, but in politics too. What benefit is it to India or America if a few pariahs are Christianized at an enormous cost? I again affirm that it is a waste of money. Send your missionaries to those who have no religion—for instance, to the interior of Africa and the South Sea Islands, and to the cities of the United States.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Let the aim of the missionary be to civilize and *educate* the savages and barbarians. To India send machinery instead of missionaries. Millions of people are kept back for want of education owing to intense poverty. Send good schoolmasters, mechanics, and scientists, and teach your practical arts to our people. This will cost you less than the missionaries.

But let us be friends, and, as children of one God, forget all differences of opinion. You have your religion and you think it the best. If it is the best, keep it yourselves. But do not revile other religions. As for faults, other religions have faults, but so has your own. Let us pray Him whom you call God, and I call Brahma, to send us enlightenment and make us love each other without consideration of caste or creed. But I assure you that you cannot thrust a new religion on an already civilized nation, whose religion is the cradle of religions; where the people are born to their religion and it is fostered through generations. Your money simply hurts their feelings and sometimes gets the curses of parents of boys who are converted by pious fraud. Christianity is best suited to the Western nations. As a religion we do not show disrespect to it, because every religion tends toward the same end, namely salvation. Christ taught beautiful things; and if all his teachings were strictly followed, the whole world would be a Paradise.

PURUSHOTAM RAO TELANG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS AS SEEN BY A MISSIONARY.

THE article which appeared in THE FORUM for April, 1894, on "Why Christian Missions Have Failed in India" attracted special attention because Mr. Gandhi (like Mr. Telang) is an educated Indian gentleman, and is supposed to speak from personal knowledge of India, if not from personal observation of missionary work. I should be extremely sorry to question the right of either Mr. Gandhi or Mr. Telang to criticise the missionaries of India or their work, and yet it ought to be said that residence in a country does not by any means carry with it knowledge of a country, with all that is going on among its people. Take, for instance, an intelligent graduate of Yale or Princeton, and ask him to write an article for the "Calcutta Review" on the present state of the Protestant churches in the United States; ask him whether any Italians have become Protestants, in what cities the Protestant movement is making most headway among the Bohemians, where the Hungarians are beginning to stir, how much has been done among the Germans, how much among the Spaniards and Portuguese, how the "slum work" is succeeding, and what is the present religious condition of the freedmen in Louisiana;—ask him to state his views on these questions, and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the intelligent graduate will be found as ignorant of the facts as if he had spent all his days in India. It is, of course, possible that an Indian gentleman may be found better informed in reference to religious movements in his own country, but the chances are all the other way. An Indian gentleman who moves in good society will never be seen in intimate personal contact with the classes among whom the missionary carries on his most successful work. He very rarely speaks to an Indian Christian, unless it be one in high position, and he seldom has an opportunity of seeing, much less inspecting, any department of missionary work. How far these remarks apply to Mr. Gandhi is seen in his extraordinary statement that not a single (Indian) Aryan had ever become a Christian!

Mr. Telang writes in a style which was current among European writers forty or fifty years ago, but which happily has now almost

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gone out of date. Sydney Smith set the first example in his famous tirade against the "consecrated cobbler" of Serampore, and for many years inferior men who could not distinguish between coarseness and wit seemed to think that the correct thing to do when writing on missionary topics was to resort to ridicule as a convenient weapon, even if a very weak one. The caricature of the American missionary and his "pariah convert" going to preach in the street was not intended —we must suppose—to be taken seriously, but it will serve to introduce a description of out-door preaching as it really is. If the reader will go to Beadon Square, in Calcutta, any Sunday evening in the year, he will find two or three Scotch missionaries, a Bengali attorney of the high court—a converted Brahman, by the way—a Bengali physician, and a few others, preaching in English to a large audience the majority of whom are intelligent undergraduates of the Calcutta University. In another public square, about two miles distant, two other groups of preachers, English, American, Bengali and Hindustani, will be found, and the people who gather to hear them are addressed by turns in three different languages. In all the large cities it is easy to find hearers who understand English, but the missionaries who resort to street preaching are, almost to a man, fluent speakers in one or more vernaculars.

Mr. Telang's statement that "a man who earns one hundred dollars a month in India can live as well as one who has a thousand dollars a month in America" is very wide of the mark. Very many missionaries receive much less than a hundred dollars a month, but at the higher figure the missionary receives about one-third of the salary of the chaplain next door, and one-fifth to one-tenth of the income of the station doctor. He sometimes pays more to the headmaster of his school than he receives himself, and always takes rank in income much below the average of the Europeans among whom he lives. He may have five or six servants, but one Irish or Swedish girl in America will do as much as the whole of them, and—including board —will cost about the same. As to having "no cares," the missionary is nearly always a burdened man, having, in addition to his own anxieties, to care for the endless interests of a score, a hundred, or perhaps five hundred families.

While speaking of these personal matters it may be as well to refer to Mr. Telang's accusation that the missionaries win their few Brahman converts by "initiating them into meat-eating and wine drinking." I can easily understand that Mr. Telang made this charge

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with a measure of confidence in its truth, for in a case of conversion such as he narrates all manner of incredible falsehoods are put into circulation; but it is necessary only to remark that nearly all missionaries are total abstainers, and that the Brahmans have no greater aversion to wine drinking than have the missionaries. Some Germans and a few English missionaries may not have adopted the rule of abstinence, but among the Americans I do not know of a single exception. It does sometimes happen that a youth is permanently separated from home and friends by becoming a Christian, not because he leaves them, but because they thrust him out. In a few cases I have known missionaries to act unwisely in giving shelter to youths under twenty years of age. The boy can legally claim freedom of conscience at sixteen, but it has never seemed to me quite right to advise a youth not fully grown to accept baptism against the will of his parents. In such cases an appeal is nearly always made to the courts, and no matter what the age of the convert, plenty of witnesses can be found to swear that he is under sixteen, while all manner of wild stories are put in circulation against the missionaries. Such cases, however, are rare. During the thirty-five years I have been in India, among more than eighty thousand baptisms in our own missions, I cannot now recall a single case in which a youth's baptism led to an appeal in the courts.

The American reader can hardly appreciate Mr. Telang's use of the word "pariah" in speaking of the convert that a missionary took with him to preach in the bazaar. Mr. Telang applies the word "pariah" to the convert preacher no less than six times. It is a term which belongs to South India, but since it has become anglicized it has come into general use, and is often applied by Europeans not only to the out-castes of Southern India, but to the meanest variety of dogs, the scavenger curs of the village. Not many Indian gentlemen of culture and refinement would apply it to a Christian preacher, but it sometimes happens that hostile writers try to identify all Christians with the out-castes, and especially those who before conversion belonged to one of the higher castes, by applying this term to them. The epithet as used by Mr. Telang was probably aimed less at this particular convert than at the general body of Indian preachers.

The pariahs of Southern India form a part of an immense division of the general community numbering about fifty million souls, or more than one-sixth of the whole population. These fifty millions are divided into many castes and sub-castes, and in recent years the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

term "depressed classes" has been applied to the whole mass, from the lowest scavengers to the more respectable artisans. The whole fifty millions are below the line of social respectability; and, although legally entitled to admission to the public schools, their children are practically excluded from them. Public sentiment would not tolerate their presence. The condition of these people is very hopeless, unless they can in some way escape from the hard lot which has fallen to them. Up to the advent of the Christian missionary in India, no door of hope had ever been opened to them, and Mr. Telang admits that this good office has been done for the pariahs by the missionaries.

The impression prevails very widely that these depressed classes can never wield much influence, even after becoming Christians; but that is by no means certain. The Brahmans are but a handful of the general community. In Northwest India, the chief seat of ancient Hinduism, the Chamars, or leather-dressers, a very low caste, are about equal in number to the Brahmans. What would the United States be to-day if the whole artisan population had been kept in a state of absolute ignorance and social degradation, from the first settlement of the country to the present day? When General Grant was President, and Henry Wilson Vice-President, the former visited Boston and was accorded a public reception. In driving in an open carriage through the streets it so happened that the President, the Vice-President, and the Governor of the State occupied seats in the same carriage with the Mayor. As they passed by, an Indian missionary said to a friend, "There go three Chamars!" General Grant had been a tanner, Henry Wilson had been a shoemaker, and Governor Claflin a leather merchant. Had Hindu caste prevailed in America these three men would have been lost to the nation, and Abraham Lincoln would have been obliged to spend his entire lifetime as a common day-laborer. India possesses within herself many of the elements which belong to a great empire, but she can never rise to a worthy position among the empires of the world while one-sixth of her people are kept in a state of dense ignorance, with every avenue of improvement rigidly closed against them. If the presence of three-and-a-half million slaves proved an incubus too heavy to be borne by the people of the United States, the presence of fifty millions of these depressed classes will prove—is proving—a burden which India cannot permanently endure. Mr. Telang frankly confesses that the hope and the help of these lowly people is in Christianity. With admirable candor, he says, "The structure of Hindu society and re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ligion is such that there is no such help for the pariah as the Christian missionary has brought to him." If it were granted that the low-caste people are mentally and physically inferior to their high-caste neighbors, the fact would remain that India as a whole will be depressed by the injustice to so large a section of the community.

But are these people so very inferior in character and natural ability to the higher castes? To this question it is impossible to give a direct answer, chiefly for the reason that they do not constitute a homogeneous community. They differ from one another not only in different parts of the country, but often when living as sub-castes side by side. It seems almost certain that they are descendants of ancient tribes who were either conquered by more civilized Aryan invaders, or brought into India as camp-followers by these invaders. Hence they have not had a common origin, and many of them may have been Aryans themselves at a very remote period. Others belong to various aboriginal races, and hence differ as widely among themselves as their remote ancestors probably did. One thing, however, is very certain; many of them are men of fine physique, with very fair mental powers, and are abundantly able to hold their own in the battle of life when Christianity gives them a fair chance. Mr. Telang says the missionaries win these people "by giving them bread, and promising them money or employment." This charge is often made by opponents of missionary work, and hence the reader will no doubt be surprised when I assure him that the missionary who works among them is troubled much more by high-caste applicants for money and employment than by those belonging to the depressed classes. During the past four years I have been among tens of thousands of these people who are becoming Christians, and the one thing which they never ask for is money. Wherever I go they beg me to provide schools for their children, but not once in six months does any one ask for food or clothing, or even mention the subject of securing a higher social position.

In fairness I ought to say that the above remarks do not apply to all the divisions of the low-caste community. Some of them are cringing and feeble creatures, with many marks of inferiority stamped upon them, but so far as my own observation has extended it is not from such communities that converts are usually drawn. On the other hand those who become Christians improve rapidly and ask no odds of the Brahmans or the Mohammedans. I have seen a son of an extremely low out-caste preparing high-caste youths for university

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

examinations. I have seen hundreds of Christian youths, whose parents had belonged to these classes in school and college with Hindu and Mohammedan boys, apparently on terms of good fellowship, and successfully holding their own in the keen competition of the school-room. I have seen many of them placed in responsible positions in the mission field, and acquitting themselves very creditably indeed. I may be too sanguine, but it is my deliberate opinion that the successors of the present generation of Christians will startle the Brahmans of the next century, by appearing on the scene as their competitors for every position of honor or emolument which the latter now hold.

It ought not to be supposed, however, that all converts in India have come from the lower classes. The Christian community has won a recognized position in the country, and in proportion to its numbers —excluding the so-called Portuguese and French Christians, whose ancestors became nominal Christians three centuries ago—stands fully abreast of any other community in the country. In proof of this I need only quote the following extract from "The Hindu," a leading Hindu paper of South India:

> "We recently approved the statement of a Bombay paper, that the social eminence which the Parsees so deservedly enjoy at the present moment was due to these two causes: that their women are well educated, and they are bound by no restrictions of caste. These two advantages make themselves felt among our native Christian brethren, and it is probable that they will soon be the Parsees of Southern India. They will furnish the most distinguished public servants, barristers, merchants, and citizens among the various classes of the native community."

This is not the testimony of a missionary, or of a Christian, but of an enlightened Hindu writer who is able to take a broad and liberal view of the situation.

In forming an estimate of the native Christian community in India, a distinction should always be drawn between the converts of the modern missionary movement, and the larger community of nominal Christians whose ancestors more than two centuries ago were, for the most part, induced to become Christians under more or less pressure by the French, the Dutch, and especially the Portuguese authorities. The hostile attitude toward missionaries assumed and long maintained by the English authorities in India was not creditable either to their courage or foresight, but beyond all doubt it was the best thing that could have happened to the English and American missionaries. It is bad enough to have Church and State allied in Christian lands, but it is a hundred times worse in a non-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Christian country. The Christianity which the Portuguese introduced into India was hardly Christian even in name. The name of Francis Xavier is still revered in India, but the Roman Catholic missionaries of the present day would not think of resorting to some of the methods employed by that illustrious saint and his followers. What might have happened, had Clive and Hastings taken it upon themselves to make the people Christians, we can hardly imagine, but it is certain that any success on the part of such men would have been worse than absolute failure. Happily for Christianity they did not make the attempt, and it was left to a lowly shoemaker, William Carey, to become the pioneer of the missionary enterprise, and hence this movement has been in operation only for a single century.

At the death of the Founder of Christianity there were about 120,000,000 inhabitants of the Roman Empire. In India there are to-day 284,000,000 souls. While I admit that the Indian converts of the century now closing are regarded with a measure of contempt by many intelligent Indians and Europeans, at the same time I venture to assert that the native Christians of India are more respected, are better known, and are more kindly regarded by the mass of the people than were the early Christians at the end of the first century after Pentecost. We are too apt to forget that the Christians of the first century were constantly taunted with their low social position. It was charged against them, and probably with truth, that the majority of the whole community were slaves. They had some great leaders, but not many. Their existence was hardly known in the "society" circles of that day, and the "leaders of thought" could not have told the name of the Founder of their religion. Gallio, who was one of the most accomplished scholars of his era, could not distinguish between Paul and Sosthenes when they appeared before him in open court. In India we have nothing corresponding to this. The Christian is an honored man in any public assembly. The Christian community is recognized in the National Congress, and Christian orators are among the foremost speakers at its annual gatherings.

Both Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Telang seem to be unaware of the change which has taken place among the mass of the people of India in their feelings toward Christian missionaries, especially in recent years. At the close of the Mutiny a general distrust of missionaries was manifested in some parts of the Empire, but this gradually passed away, and a very different feeling now prevails, especially among the common people. The missionary is regarded as the friend of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poor, the representative of public morality, and the promoter of reform. The common people are able to distinguish between spurious Christianity and that which is genuine. In every European regiment a few dozen God-fearing soldiers were found, and in the regimental bazaars these men are usually well known to be different from their comrades. Among the more intelligent classes the distinction between nominal and real Christianity is understood to a surprising extent. Nor is there that strong aversion toward the missionaries on account of their "meat-eating" and disregard of animal life of which Mr. Gandhi especially speaks. The sacredness of all life was a tenet of Buddhism, but that religion has long since ceased to exist in India, while in Burmah, where the people are still Buddhists, the use of fish as an article of food is universal. The Burman explains his apparent inconsistency by saying that he never kills a fish, or causes one to be killed, but merely lays it on the bottom of his boat where it dies of its own accord! When, some years ago, I chanced to live in a district infested by bears and leopards, my Brahman and Rajpoot neighbors never failed to send for me when a bear appeared in their grain fields, or a leopard among their cattle, and so far from being shocked when I came to their aid with two double-barrelled guns, their only complaint was that I was a very bad marksman.

The reader in America will probably be surprised to hear that Calcutta had a "Parkhurst movement" in progress before the present agitation in New York was commenced. A little more than a year ago a great mass-meeting was held in the town-hall, in aid of this movement, which was attended by about 3,000 persons, representing all classes of the community, both Indian and European. An American missionary was made chairman, on the nomination of an orthodox Hindu, a Justice of the High Court of Calcutta. Among the speakers were the Parsee sheriff of the city, the European principal of the Jesuit college, one of the ablest and most respected physicians in the city, an Anglican clergyman, a Bengali Christian lawyer, a Mohammedan gentleman, and several other speakers. The editor of the "Indian Mirror," who is a Brahman, and a gentleman who has never hesitated to criticise missionaries, including the chairman of the meeting, asked to be allowed to move the usual vote of thanks to the chairman. In doing so this gentleman took occasion to express the gratitude of his countrymen to the Christian missionaries of Bengal, saying, in substance, that the latter had again and again come to the help of the Indian people when their best interests were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in jeopardy; and, in the midst of enthusiastic cheers, he assured the whole missionary body that the multitudes for whom he spoke would not fail to appreciate those who had so uniformly shown their good will toward the Indian people. This is only one example of good feeling, it may be granted; but in the course of the last twenty years I have witnessed frequent demonstrations, in Calcutta and elsewhere, which were hardly less significant.

So far as I have noticed, all the Indian gentlemen who have recently written or spoken unfavorably of Christian missionaries, preserve a discreet silence in reference to missionary work among the women of India. Mr. Vivekananda has ventured to say of woman in India, that "from the Hindu standpoint she receives all her rights," but he did not explain that the orthodox standpoint was one from which women of the highest caste are viewed as on the same plane, intellectually, as the pariah. To the Christian missionary alone, the women of India are indebted for the door to education and intellectual progress which now stands wide open before them. No more difficult task has ever been undertaken in any missionary field than that of demonstrating to the people of India that their women could learn, that it would be safe to permit them to learn, and that it was of the first importance that schools should be provided for them. It would require a volume to tell the whole story, but suffice it to say that the field has been fairly won, that Hindu and Mohammedan ladies are now competing in many places with missionary teachers in the zenanas, that schools for girls are multiplying, that many influential gentlemen are deeply interested in the cause of women's education, and that there are now two institutions of college grade for women, while a third, under Hindu auspices, is about to be started. One of these colleges is non-sectarian, but most of the pupils belong to Brahman or other advanced Hindu families. The principal of this college is an accomplished Bengali Christian lady, whose education was chiefly received in a missionary institution. The third institution mentioned above is said to be intended as in some measure a rival to the flourishing Christian college for girls which has been for some time in operation in the same city. This, however, is by no means a discouraging omen to the missionaries. The more rival schools, the better evidence they have that their educational work has not been in vain.

I will mention only one other instance of an invaluable work accomplished by missionaries for the women of India, for which as yet but scanty credit has been given. I can remember very well when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the first woman physician who had ever been sent into a non-Christian country arrived in India to take up the work of a medical missionary. Many readers will remember how much courage and perseverance were required by those women who ventured to act as pioneers of the medical sisterhood in America. The opposition which they incurred amounted to little short of downright persecution. If this was the case in the United States, it need hardly be said that the first female physician who ventured to offer her services to the women of India required a measure of courage, patience, and tact—to say nothing of professional skill—of the highest possible quality. Dr. Clara Swain was the pioneer upon whom this honor fell.

She arrived in India as late as 1870, and still remains engaged in her noble work. About the same time Dr. J. L. Humphrey made the first attempt to give Indian women a training in medicine. In this work he was ably seconded by Dr. Swain, and in due time it was fully demonstrated that the women of India could not only be persuaded to receive treatment from physicians of their own sex, but that they themselves could be trained for the medical profession, and thus a lucrative employment be found for them, and at the same time a service of unspeakable value rendered to the secluded women of India, who previously had been shut off from all medical aid.

Other women physicians soon followed Miss Swain, and in the course of a very few years all doubts with regard to the value of such services as these ladies were able to render had completely vanished. It thus happened that the way was prepared for what is now known as the "Dufferin movement." A returned woman missionary was honored with an audience by Queen Victoria, and ventured to speak to Her Majesty of the need of medical help for the women of India; and, when Lord Dufferin was appointed Viceroy, the Queen warmly commended the subject to Lady Dufferin, who chanced to be admirably fitted in every way for taking the lead in such a work. As soon as she arrived in India she took up the matter in earnest, made inquiries upon every hand, formed far-reaching plans, solicited aid from all possible donors, and in due time succeeded in establishing one of the most important humanitarian agencies ever introduced into India. The whole world has heard the story; and the fame of Lady Dufferin will forever be inseparable from her great project of giving medical aid to the women of India. It ought not to be forgotten, however, that but for the missionary women "the Dufferin movement" would most certainly never have been inaugurated. The possibility of such a move-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment was first clearly demonstrated, and nearly all the real difficulties involved were removed, before Lady Dufferin arrived in India.

Mr. Telang speaks in very severe terms of the "enormous cost" of missionary work as at present conducted, and calls the expenditure "a waste of money." On the other hand, I venture to affirm that, when the extent of the work and its results are fairly considered, it is the most inexpensive work to be found in the whole wide field of benevolent enterprise throughout the world. As I am at a distance from India, and have no statistics of other societies at hand, I must beg to be allowed to refer to the missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church in India and Malaysia, which chance to be under my superintendence. The total number of missionaries employed in this field is 78, with 75 wives of missionaries, and 38 unmarried ladies. I omit these from the calculation altogether, as Mr. Telang pleads for education and other kinds of non-religious work. I omit the large staff of Indian preachers, churches and chapels, and even the medical and industrial features of the work. I omit also the four publishing houses, and all that is done in the way of preparing and distributing literature among the people, and after making all these omissions we have the following result:

We have 1,204 day-schools, 302 of which are for girls. It will certainly be granted that $100 a year is a very moderate sum to allow for each of these schools. We have 13 orphanages, and surely no one will object to an estimate of $20,000 a year for this item. We have also 18 cheap boarding-schools for the children of the poor, for which I put down the very moderate sum of $18,000, or $1,000 each. There remain 11 high schools, for which an estimate of $25,000 ought certainly to be accepted as very reasonable. We have thus:

Day-schools	1,204	$120,400
Orphanages	13	20,000
Boarding-schools	18	18,000
High-schools	11	25,000
Total		$183,400

The total amount sent out during 1894 by the two missionary societies which support this vast work was $229,917. According to Mr. Telang's estimate the married missionaries alone would have received $93,600, and when we add to this not only 38 unmarried ladies, but also more than 1,200 Indian preachers, four publishing houses, two colleges, one theological seminary, an extensive medical work, and various industrial enterprises, the reader cannot fail to see

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that an immense amount of valuable work is going forward at a cost which is so slight, when compared with American rates, that it seems almost nominal.

As one who has long been resident in India, I can understand, and to some extent sympathize, with Mr. Telang's feelings, when he sees the ancestral faith of his country challenged by the followers of what seems to him not only an alien religion, but a religion which the foreign rulers of his country, in the very nature of the case, seem to be constantly thrusting before him. The people of India have never been conquered by the English, and do not, in the proper sense of the word, occupy the position of a conquered people. A few Englishmen have built up a great empire in India, but in doing so they have as often been helped as opposed by Indian princes and Indian armies. The Government of India is English, and yet in a sense Asiatic. Mr. Telang may yet live to help to make laws for the empire. All this is true, and yet the aspiring Indian cannot but remember that the foreigner is in the land, that the highest places are his, and that the India of the golden age of Hinduism is steadily passing away. No people in the world are so proud of their ancestry as the higher classes of India, and it is not strange that many of them cling with desperate tenacity to their ancient traditions, and oppose Christianity as the embodiment of all the alien influences which seem more and more to endanger the very existence of all that has, from time immemorial, been most distinctive in the ideas and institutions of the country. The Indian's pride of ancestry is natural and, within limits, commendable, but it is at present a source of great weakness. It hinders his progress and makes him blind to the inevitable. It chills all feeling of real patriotism by trying to substitute an impossible past for a hopeful present and a splendid future. Happily, many leading men in India see this clearly, and not a few who decline to accept Christianity personally are practically adopting its spirit and commending its precepts. It is the only religious system ever propagated among men which is equally well adapted to every clime and every people, and in due time the people of India will discover that it is no more alien to them than the air which they breathe, or the rain which fills their magnificent rivers. It is the common heritage of all humanity.

J. M. THOBURN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHARITY THAT HELPS AND OTHER CHARITY.

OUR word "charity" has strayed far away from the χάρις of the Greek, which signified the treating of a person kindly, as if he were of the same kind or kin as one's self. It is chiefly with the desire to make clear this meaning of the word charity, and to urge a new standard of kindness, that I have gathered together a few of the stories of our neighbors of the College Settlement in New York City, as they have come to us through this last terrible year of distress.

The College Settlement is simply several young women who are trying to be friends to those who are near them, and we learn to know much of the lives of many of our neighbors. Many know something of the sorrows and sufferings of the poor, but it is a privilege given to only a few to know well their everyday home-life.

Through all the past year of distress, though the rich have given thousands of dollars, it is the poor who have given the most freely. "There is no way of calculating the kind deeds of neighbor to neighbor till the judgment day." The only natural form of relief is the help given by friend to friend. When a feeble old man without relatives and absolutely penniless was asked by a friend of mine if he ever suffered from hunger, "Never," he answered. My friend asked him, "What do you do?" and he replied promptly, "I go and get something." There was always ready for him in some neighbor's house a pail of soup or a bowl of coffee.

Scattered about among the tenements there are many who, in ordinary times, make a bare living by scrubbing floors and by doing washing for those who are better off than themselves. In a time of great poverty there is no money to pay for such work, and these people become helpless. One such old woman came to the housekeeper of a Chrystie-Street tenement and told of her great need. The housekeeper had neither work nor money to offer, but she sent out her daughter, who usually did the house-cleaning, to look for work. The girl obtained a temporary position in a large dry-goods store, and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

house-cleaning was given to the old woman, the mother simply saying, "Elsie could get a job when the old lady couldn't."

In many a house a lodger who could no longer pay for a bed has received shelter month after month. One Russian Hebrew who had been in the United States only nine months had three such lodgers, and none of them could pay anything. A young man out of work received a bed from a friend for six months, and, now that he has work again, he can pay his debts, and he can be counted as one more saved from going down in this struggle for existence.

The cause of a friendless young fellow always appeals strongly to the people of the tenements. An effort had been made to find work for a boy who needed it very much, but one day he came in to say that if a position was found for him, he would like to have it given to his friend; and another boy in the group explained, "You know he's almost the same as an orphan. His mother died when he was a baby, and he has had a few step-mothers, and now his father is dead."

A cobbler, who finds life a struggle much of the time, shared his meals for several months with a young man who had just returned from prison. He said that he thought there was some good in the fellow after all, and he would not be the better for starving.

It is hard, even for us who live among the poor, to realize fully what it means to be out of work—the fruitless search for employment day after day, the coming home at night unsuccessful, to see the hard-earned savings growing less and less, the gradual going-down step by step, seeing the children every day getting thinner and thinner, and to be powerless to help! Parents whose children are all too young to be wage-earners are most to be pitied. One little girl expressed the feelings of many a careful mother as she said in trembling tones, unconscious of the pathos of it all, "My mother says she cannot look at us, when she has not to give us to eat."

It is a painful fact that charity has been made so repulsive that even many of those who are in great distress are unwilling to accept help. One woman who was accidentally discovered without fire on a bitterly cold day refused to receive coal from a relief society, even though she had begun to pawn her bedding. The neighbors have often been kept carefully in ignorance of the new poverty which is so hard to bear, and even the children have learned to be cautious as to what they say. Here in the Settlement the members of two children's clubs were asked to give up their Christmas presents in order that the money might be used to buy shoes for other children, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they gladly agreed to do so. One little girl was asked if she knew any one to whom she would like her present to go, and she answered in a whisper, "I know a little girl, but I must first ask her mother if I can give her name." A small boy came in one day with shining eyes and said, "I want to tell you something, but nobody else must hear." It was only a pathetic story of a neighbor's struggle with want. There is a pitiful sameness in these stories. After a few weeks or a few months of enforced idleness, all the money that has been saved is exhausted and all the furniture and clothing of any value is sold or pawned. Many of the "new poor" have pawn-tickets amounting to more than a hundred dollars.

Relatives and friends lend money freely. A sister who had no money lent her watch to be pawned. One man who had found work for a few weeks paid a third of his wages to the family upstairs, as he had borrowed from them a short time before, and he was now better off than they.

Even in ordinary times the rent is a large item in the living expenses; and, when there is no work, the thought of the rent becomes a horrible nightmare. The landlords have been unusually lenient. Perhaps in some cases leniency is only a choice of evils; for, even if the present tenant were evicted, the next one might be equally unable to pay his debts. We have, however, heard many a struggling tenant say, "Our landlord is a good man. He is never hard on us." Many of the evils of the tenements are due to the fact that the owner and the agent know but little of the circumstances of their tenants. They often leave the collecting of the rents to the housekeeper, usually some man or woman who receives the rent of three or four rooms in payment for the work of caring for the house. The best way to reform tenements is to place their management in the care of the best housekeepers. In the distress of last winter many a housekeeper took a little food every day to some tenant whose poverty was known to her alone. One housekeeper induced the landlord to give the rent for two months to a family in great need, and she told me in broken English, "Our landlord would have put out lots of people if it wasn't through me. I told the landlord it's because these people not got work." Every once in a while, families are forcibly evicted, and you will see a pitiable collection of household goods on the sidewalk. Often the mother sits there, and at her side is a plate into which the passers-by drop their pennies. One such plate held eighteen dollars before dark. It happens not infrequently that a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

friend in a little better circumstances will offer the rent of a room till something else can be found. Many know that when the worst comes a relative or friend, or even perhaps a chance acquaintance, will take the children, but with a natural pride they put off as long as possible the evil day when they must confess themselves beaten in the struggle for existence. I asked one man, who had formerly been an English butler, where his wife was, and he answered, "She has gone to Newark to some friends, but she did not go till she was clemmed with hunger."

A German family consisting of a man, his wife, and two children, lived comfortably in three rooms in a Stanton-Street tenement, until the man had no work and the woman became ill. When the money was gone they went to live with a sister, all in one room; and the sister, by scrubbing and washing, kept the whole family together.

There lives in Orchard Street a family of pale, underfed children who have never had enough to eat. As the father is an inefficient workingman, the only reliable sources of income are the wages of a half-grown boy and the little that the mother earns by washing; but the mother took in the entire family of a sister-in-law who had been evicted, and, when the sister-in-law's baby died, they managed somehow to pay the funeral expenses and thus to keep free from that last horror, the potter's field.

It has seemed to us sometimes that the whole world was unemployed, but occasionally our attention has been attracted to a man struggling to do double duty, because he was so fortunate as to have work. Up at the top of a rickety tenement in Scammel Street, there lives a workingman who has had steady employment. His cousin, however, was in trouble, and so the family made room for her and for her child. She fell ill; and a nurse visiting the sick woman noticed that every day she found a strange woman and her children there. Upon inquiring, she learned that they live in the tenement in the rear, and while the father went out every day seeking work, they were invited in, that the meals might be shared. Thus one man who had work took care of two families besides his own through the greater part of the winter.

The owners of the small stores have done a great deal to prevent suffering. Many of them have sold on credit, hoping for better times. The bakers always give freely. As one baker's wife said, "If there is no old bread, one must give new." Giving is so natural that it is promptly forgotten. I asked one German grocer if he gave away food,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and he answered slowly, "Very seldom." When I asked him what he did when people came in and said that they had nothing in the house to eat, he answered, "Oh, I give them a few beans or a little coffee or a little rice, but not many come in. I don't think we had more than three a day all winter, though we did count twenty-six last Thursday, counting beggars and all." In our immediate neighborhood the small dealers showed themselves ready to respond to every demand upon their charity. At the beginning of the hard times a relief committee consisting of twelve men was organized by the United Hebrew Trades in Delancey Street. They collected nearly a thousand dollars, and contributions of supplies were made by many of the small dealers in the neighborhood. Forty thousand pounds of bread and six thousand pounds of meat, besides flour and potatoes, were distributed. Physicians gave their services, and druggists gave medicines. Tobacco to the amount of four hundred pounds was given, and two thousand tickets for shaving were sent in by the barbers. The indifference of the owners of some of the large retail dry-goods stores in Grand Street, two blocks away, was in painful contrast to the kindness of those who keep the small stores.

Many of the trades-unions were able to help their own members most effectively. The Tin- and Sheet-Iron Workers' Association numbers four-hundred-and-fifty members, and besides donating two hundred dollars when it was most needed, they lent one thousand five hundred dollars to be repaid to the Union, payments to begin three months after work was found. It is said that Typographical Union Number 6 distributed wisely ten thousand dollars. Many other unions did similarly efficient work.

Such are the scattered records of a few kind deeds. They are the merest fragments in the unwritten history of "the simple, quiet, kindly help of the poor to the poor." If the rich lived on the East side next door to poverty, they would catch the neighborly spirit. One of our neighbors who is considered rich by those about us saw the family of a musician evicted from the tall tenement next door, and he took them all in till the father could find work.

There is many a rich man seated to-day with easy conscience at a table shining with cut-glass and silver, who would be ready to stretch out a helping hand to those who need it, if they were not "all so far away." He is living in another world. What he does is to make his annual contributions to our charitable societies, and that is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all. Some day we shall begin to calculate the evil resulting from such contributions. Again and again is it true of the charity of to-day that "it curseth him who gives and him who takes." On the one hand the poor man, sinking down into the mire of pauperism, realizes dimly the bitterness of his degradation, and takes the alms offered him with curses in his heart; while on the other hand the rich merchant or manufacturer, who is daily disregarding the health of little children and delicate girls, quiets his conscience with a large check in the name of charity. And society applauds the generosity of such a man, and his eyes are blinded. "It is so tempting to the rich to think that by giving a check for the support of a social scheme, poverty may be abolished, and they be left free to enjoy their wealth. They always hope that something, *not themselves*, may meet all needs." It is very easy to make friends with those who have had few opportunities, for they are by nature frank and outspoken; and through every such friendship there comes a chance of escape out of the narrow conventional life of the rich into the broader, simpler life of the great human family.

Many years ago a young man said that he truly wished to enter into life, and the great Teacher told him to go and learn of those who had few possessions, but he turned away sorrowfully. It was true then, as it is true to-day, that the rich man, shut up in his own little circle and so cut off from the larger human life, is himself the greatest sufferer.

One is often asked the question, "What can the rich man do for the relief of suffering?" I believe that there is but one answer: Let him give not alms but himself, and the wisdom comes with the giving. I knew a young apprentice in a great machine-shop who was stricken down with consumption. His parents were old and feeble, and it was only through the gifts of his employer that his last days were made comfortable, but more to them all than the gifts was the fact that the employer came himself to the little home in the East-side tenement, and spoke friendly words. From every such natural friendship there grow more and more chances for helpfulness, and for that truest charity of all charities—the treating of others as if they were of our own kind.

JANE ELIZABETH ROBBINS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BRIEF ESTIMATES OF NOTABLE NEW BOOKS.

Life of Frances Power Cobbe, by herself. 2 vols. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $4.00.

RECENT books are richer in Biographies, Reminiscences, and Letters than in any other department. Easily first in this group is the autobiography of Miss Cobbe, which is a very cheerful record of a life that has been "an interesting one to live," an interesting one, too, to know in so frank and familiar a way; for it has been a very active, sane, and cheerful life, covering a most important period. The book gives much information about most of the notable men and women (especially English) of the last fifty years, and letters from many of them. It has, besides the charm of cheerful reminiscence and entertaining gossip, a more serious value, for her life very forcibly illustrates the great widening of the range of women's activity and influence these fifty years.

Edwin Booth. Recollections by his daughter, Edwina Booth Grossman. Century Co. $3.00.

Attractive, too, is the handsome volume of Letters of Edwin Booth, together with his daughter's Recollections. These letters, to his daughter and a group of his most intimate friends, show the playful, familiar qualities of the man rather than his serious reflections on his art or on any subject. Many of them are commonplace; and, although they are all interesting, they owe their interest rather to the personality of Mr. Booth than to the matter of the letters themselves. But they contain passages of permanent value.

The Life of Charles Loring Brace, chiefly told in his own letters, edited by his daughter. With portraits. Scribner. $2.50.

The record of the life and work of the late Charles Loring Brace, so told by selections from his letters as to have much of the charm of an autobiography, is as inspiring a book—inspiring to the most unselfish activity—as could be made of the life of any private American citizen of the last fifty years. Mr. Brace's chief work, of course, was the establishment and maintenance of the Children's Aid Society, but the same spirit that moved him to this work shone through all his life and activity.

Domestic Manners of the Americans, by Mrs. Trollope. 2 vols. Dodd, Mead & Co. $3.50.

It was a happy idea to republish Mrs. Trollope's classic volumes of 1832, which irritated our ancestors, and which have been a precious boon to our historians. This is a book

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that has a legitimate claim to a second lease of life. To this day no book more interesting has been written about American manners.

Since the death of Thoreau, nine volumes have been published of his manuscripts and fugitive pieces, and this volume of letters makes the tenth. A collection of his letters appeared thirty years ago, selected to show the philosopher rather than the man. This present collection includes letters illustrating particularly his "domestic and gossipy mood." The editor has not rejected the common and trivial, desiring to present "this piquant original just as he was." The book is in every way well edited.

Familiar Letters of Henry David Thoreau, edited by Frank B. Sanborn. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.50.

In "The Early Public Life of William Ewart Gladstone," Mr. Alfred F. Robbins has dealt only with Mr. Gladstone's career down to 1840, "with an amount of detail which has not before been attempted." The book gives evidence of thorough work, with frequent references to original sources. Mr. Robbins has permitted many of Gladstone's early contemporaries—and such a plan is cruel to many of them—to give their estimates of him in their own words.

The Early Public Life of William Ewart Gladstone, by A. F. Robbins. Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.50.

General Hyde's well-written volume of very interesting personal reminiscences of the civil war is well worth reading, in spite of the many similar volumes that have caused a temporary satiety with this kind of literature.

Following the Greek Cross, by Thomas W. Hyde, brevet-brigadier-general of volunteers. Portraits. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.25.

An important biography,—important as a biography as well as for its bearings upon both literature and history, is Mr. Thomas Wright's "Life of Defoe." By reason of its scholarly work, its fulness, and its style, it may at once be accepted as the standard life of Defoe.

The Life of Daniel Defoe, by Thomas Wright, principal of Cowper School, Olney. Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. Illustrated. $3.75.

Very welcome to the most cultivated readers will be the second series of "Eighteenth Century Vignettes," by Austin Dobson, which contains studies of last century subjects and men by the greatest living master of that period. There are no literary essays nowadays done with a surer hand or a more delicate touch. Very excellent, too, are Miss Guiney's essays, her subjects falling within the same period—gathered into a dainty volume. At once solid and graceful, too, is Mr. Horace E. Scudder's "Childhood in Literature and Art,"

Eighteenth Century Vignettes, second series, by Austin Dobson. Dodd, Mead & Co. $2.00.

A Little English Gallery, by Louise Imogen Guiney. Harper. $1.00.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Childhood in Literature and Art, by Horace E. Scudder. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.75.

Greek, Roman, Hebrew, Early Christian, Mediæval, English, French, German and American, and a separate essay on Hans Christian Andersen—nine essays of wide range, some of which readers of "The Atlantic Monthly" will pleasantly recall. And of our American literary essayists none now at work is more useful than Mr. Mabie, further evidences of whose graceful faculty of compressing sound literary judgments into brief space is given in this latest collection of papers on a very wide range of topics. Mrs. Oliphant's running review of writers of the Victorian era, great and small, is both biographical and critical; more interesting than profound; a most excellent sketch and a book of great practical utility, especially to young readers, or as a first sketch for older readers. A very practical book has grown out of Mr. Thwing's own work as President of the College for Women of Western Reserve University—full of the common sense and helpfulness that are the outcome of very earnest personal experience.

My Study Fire, by Hamilton Wright Mabie, second series. Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.50.

The Victorian Age of English Literature, by Mrs. Oliphant. 2 vols. Lovell, Coryell & Co. $3.50.

The College Woman, by Charles F. Thwing. The Baker & Taylor Co. $1.00.

Portraits in Plaster, from the collection of Laurence Hutton. Harper. $6.00.

Accompanying the ghostly but interesting pictures of the death-masks of many historic persons is Mr. Hutton's gossipy text about the persons and the masks and the features and characteristics suggested. The volume is one of the most attractive books of the season.

Unguarded Gates, and other poems, by Thomas Bailey Aldrich. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.25.

The pretty volume of Mr. Thomas Bailey Aldrich's recent poems bears the title of his ringing warning that appeared a little while ago in "The Atlantic Monthly"—"Unguarded Gates." It contains also "Elmwood" in memory of Lowell, and other recent poems. Into one volume Mr. Gilder has gathered his preceding five books of poetry, with some new poems, making a single complete edition of the author's poems to date.

Five Books of Song, by Richard Watson Gilder. The first complete collection of Mr. Gilder's poems. Illustrated. Century Co. $2.50.

Wealth Against Commonwealth, by Henry Demarest Lloyd. Harper. $2.50.

Mr. Henry Demarest Lloyd, whose writings in analysis of monopolies, and in hostility to them, especially in criticism of the Standard Oil Company, have engaged him for some years, now issues in much larger bulk than hitherto his study of the rise of this company and an explanation of his industrial philosophy, which is, that "monopolies have become a despotism over the public." The book is a stout volume, full

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of testimony given before investigating committees, all so used as to make a narrative and written in a very emphatic style.

City Government in the United States, by Alfred R. Conkling. Appleton. $1.00.

"A primer of science of city-government" is Mr. Conkling's own description of his very practical and useful book, which sets forth the central facts of municipal organization and administration. It is a most opportune manual, the best as well as the latest.

Religious Progress, by Professor A. V. G. Allen. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.00.

The lectures delivered at Yale by Professor Allen, of the Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge, on Religious Progress, make a notable summary of the advance of Christian thought and of its present status and its outlook, and are one of the most notable contributions, in fact, to religious literature of the year.

The New Acts of the Apostles; or the Marvels of Modern Missions, by Arthur T. Pierson. The Baker & Taylor Co. $1.50.

Important also are the Rev. Arthur T. Pierson's lectures delivered in Scotland last year, narrating and reviewing in a practical and inspiring way the work done in every land by Christian missionaries. It is a stirring story, told with spirit and sympathy. Accompanying his book is a religious map of the world.

The Gospel of Buddha, according to Old Records, told by Dr. Paul Carus. The Open Court Publishing Co. $1.50.

Dr. Carus's book is an explanation of Buddhism—it might be said *is* Buddhism, since much of the book is a translation of the Buddhist sacred writings, but so selected as to give a consecutive and proper understanding of them.

Christianity Practically Applied, being theDiscussions of the International Christian Conferences held in Chicago, 1893, under the auspices of the Evangelical Alliance for the United States. 2 vols. The Baker & Taylor Co. $2 each.

There have been issued in two volumes the discussions of the International Christian Conferences held in Chicago, 1893, under the auspices of the Evangelical Alliance. Vol. 1 contains the Addresses of Greeting and Responses, the Addresses setting forth the Condition of Protestant Christendom, Christian Union and Co-operation, and the Church and Local Problems, and Vol. 2 contains the Evangelistic, Reformatory, Social, Educational, and Miscellaneous Addresses.

Our Home Pets: How to Keep Them Well and Happy, by Olive Thorne Miller. Illustrated. Harper. $1.25.

Mrs. Miller, who in a certain sense has the bird-world as her personal property for loving interpretation, has written plainly but sympathetically a practical book about the care of pets—birds and other; and nobody could do the task better.

A volume of short stories and sketches of Scotch life, in dialect, published first a little while ago in England under

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Beside the Bonny Brier Bush, by Ian Maclaren. Dodd, Mead & Co. $1,25.

the *nom de plume* of Ian Maclaren, shows so true a touch of humor and of pathos that these sketches have already taken their place along with the best of the considerable volume of recent Scotch literature. These scenes of simple life are pictures no reader will easily forget. Some of them strike very deep down into the fundamental emotions.

Among the beautiful volumes of the month are Theodore Child's "Wimples and Crisping-Pins," studies in coiffure and ornaments (Harper, $2); an elegant two-volume profusely illustrated edition of "Hypatia," from drawings by William Martin Johnson—very handsomely manufactured in every respect (Harper, $7); a two-volume edition of "Memoirs of the Duchesse de Gontaut," translated by Mrs. J. W. Davis (Dodd, Mead & Co., $5); a very elegant edition of Tennyson's "Becket," illustrated by F. C. Gordon (Dodd, Mead & Co., $2); a very handsome edition of "Holland," by Edmondo de Amicis, translated from the Italian by Miss Helen Zimmern (and this translator is worthy of the picturesque and most interesting author), very beautifully illustrated (Porter & Coates, $5); a convenient and pretty edition of "A Tale of Two Cities," illustrated by Edmund H. Garrett (2 vols., Dodd, Mead & Co., $3.50).

From A. C. McClurg & Co. come two interesting translations—"Tales from the Ægean," being short stories of Greek life by the foremost modern Greek writer, Demetrios Bikélas, translated by L. E. Opdycke ($1); and "Jewish Tales," by Leopold von Sacher-Masoch, translated from the French by Harriet Lieber Cohen ($1)—both very excellent and interesting. Another convenient translation of note, "At the Ghost Hour," consists of four dainty little volumes, each containing a tale from the German of Paul Heyse, translated by Frances A. Van Santford, with many decorations by Alice C. Morse (4 vols. in case, Dodd, Mead & Co., $2).

There comes from William Beverly Harison (New York) the useful educational series of historical summaries: "The Evolution of Empire Series," in which Mary Parmele condenses history with unsurpassed skill, making a first sketch of each nation's history within the space of about a hundred pages of large type; "The Theory and Practice of Handwriting," revised edition, being an explanation of the practice of vertical writing and of its far-reaching importance by its originator, Mr. John Jackson; and Klemm's excellent relief-maps, in paper.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED